



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

R E M A R K S

O N

JOSEPHUS'S ACCOUNT

O F

HEROD'S REBUILDING

O F T H E

TEMPLE AT JERUSALEM;

Occasioned by a Pamphlet lately published entitled Evidence that the Relation of JOSEPHUS concerning HEROD'S having new built the Temple at Jerusalem is either false or misinterpreted.

BY T. BURGESS, A. M.

FELLOW OF CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, DOMESTIC
CHAPLAIN TO THE HONOURABLE AND RIGHT
REVEREND THE LORD BISHOP OF SALISBURY, AND
PREBENDARY OF SALISBURY.

O X F O R D:

SOLD BY D. PRINCE AND J. COOKE; AND J. AND J.
FLETCHER: AND BY ELMSLY, PAYNE, WHITE;
LONDON.

M DCC LXXX VIII.



TO THE
HONOURABLE AND RIGHT REVEREND
THE LORD BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

MY LORD,

THE public are too well acquainted with your regard for ancient Learning, and for the advancement of Sacred Criticism, not to anticipate any reasons which I might offer for publishing under the patronage of your Lordship's name an humble attempt to illustrate a much disputed point in Sacred Antiquities. Waving therefore every thing, which a knowledge of your public character could suggest, and the most grateful sense of personal respect could dictate, I shall content myself with accounting to your Lordship for the publication of the following Remarks. They were occasioned by a Pamphlet lately published, entitled, "*Evidence that the Relation of Josephus concerning Herod's having new built the Temple at Jerusalem is either false or misinterpreted.*" Whichever conclusion be admitted, Josephus's character

character is at stake. If the latter, he becomes charged with a confused, negligent narrative; rendered purposely ambiguous, from a dishonest intention of imposing on his readers. If the former, the imputed falshood will tend to weaken the credibility of his Testimony in general, which every Christian, who inquires into the grounds of that belief, which he professes, must consider as interwoven with the fundamental reasons of his faith. A full and just examination of the Historical Character of Josephus, which demands the amplest resources of sacred and profane philology, I do not pretend to undertake: but as it seemed to require little either of sagacity or learning to remove the imputations above mentioned, I was induced to pursue the whole of the Inquiry as far as it is exhibited in the "Evidence," and through the following Remarks submit the result to the judgment of your Lordship and the public.

I have the honour to be,

MY LORD,

Your Lordship's dutiful and obliged
Servant and Chaplain,

T. BURGESS,

Oxford, *March*, 1788.



R E M A R K S
O N
J O S E P H U S ' S A C C O U N T
O F
H E R O D ' S R E B U I L D I N G
O F T H E
T E M P L E A T J E R U S A L E M ,



REMARKS, &c.

Συντε δὴν συνεπόμενα σχέδον εὐρησόμενα.

PLATO. Alcib. II.

THE Temple of Jerusalem was situated on a rocky eminence accessible only on one side. It consisted of the ναός * or *House of God* properly so called, containing the Sanctuary and Holy of Holies ; and the περιβολοί, i.e. the στοά, οἶκοι, and other buildings. The buildings which surrounded the ναός were not only subservient to purposes of religion, but formed a military post of great strength, which was an object of jealousy to all the enemies of Judea. When the Jews, who returned from the Babylonish Captivity were employed, by the permission of Cyrus, in rebuilding the Temple, the neighbouring nations soon grew jealous of their reestablishment. The Jews had made but little progress in the building of the Temple,† when

* The word *Temple* is used in four different senses : (1.) it means the whole ἱερόν, i.e. the ναός and τὰ περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ : (2.) the building which consisted of the ναός and the porch, (3.) the *House of God* containing the Sanctuary and Holy of Holies, exclusive of the Porch ; (4.) in its strictest sense, the Sanctuary alone.

† See note p. 25, 26. of these Remarks.

these

these nations represented them to the king of Persia as a turbulent and seditious people, who if once reestablished, would withdraw from him their allegiance and tribute. The progress of the building was accordingly interdicted, though, it is said, without the knowledge of Cyrus. The Jews however often attempted to proceed with the building; and were as often inhibited. But the restraint, which was clandestinely imposed during the life of Cyrus by the Governors of the Persian Provinces, was confirmed by the sanction of his successor. Cambyfes revoked the decree of Cyrus; and the Jews were compelled to desist from the further prosecution of their undertaking.

In this imperfect state the Building continued for near fourteen years; when Zerubbabel and Joshua were incited by the Prophets Haggai and Zechariah to renew the building of the Temple. Among other circumstances of encouragement the prophecy of Haggai is generally supposed to contain a prediction, that the Temple, which he was urging them to build, should be more glorious than Solomon's, because it should be glorified by the presence of the MESSIAH. The words of the Prophet are, Ch. ii. 6—9.

This celebrated Prophecy has occasioned a variety of opinions; and great diligence
and

and learning have been employed in explaining its object and application. *

1. Some apply it to the external splendor and magnitude of the Temple ; as Mr. PEIRCE, HOUBIGANT, and Dr. HEBERDEN.

2. Others to the personal appearance of the Messiah in the Temple ; as ECKIUS, VILLALPANDUS, SPANHEIM, &c.

* A Prophecy which has produced such a variety of opinions can never be said to be so *singularly plain* as it is called by a late *Remarker* on the BISHOP OF EXETER'S Sermon on the subject of this Prophecy. Some of the difficulties attending the usual application of the Prophecy have been pointed out by Dr. HEBERDEN, and by Mr. PEIRCE in his notes on the Epistle to the Hebrews, which by no means deserve the neglect with which they are treated in the *Remarks* before alluded to. " Mr. Peirce (it is said, p. 23.) was certainly a very ingenious and a very shrewd and subtle writer ; a dissenter, and a very strenuous advocate for the Arian Heresy. What objections he raises against the common interpretation it is not material here to enquire. His cause required him to make objections to it, and most probably his objections are no better than his cause. Let them therefore rest quietly in his book, where he hath placed them." This is certainly not written with that cautious deliberation and prudence, which the *Remarker* at the beginning of his *Remarks* so justly thinks necessary to the interpretation of Scripture Prophecy. A writer, who is anxious only for the discovery of Truth, so far from rejecting *any* Evidence, from whatever quarter it may come, which can contribute to the complete investigation of his Subject, will rather be solicitous to canvass with a temperate, though severe impartiality the opinions of men the most hostile to his cause.

3. Others

3. Others both to the external appearance of the Temple and to the presence of the Messiah; as CHRYSOSTOM, JEROM, RIBERA, and GATAKER.

4. Others apply it neither to the external magnitude or splendor of the Temple, nor to the personal appearance of the Messiah: but allegorically to the Christian Church, as the present BISHOP OF EXETER.*

5. Others apply it both literally and allegorically, namely, to the personal appearance of Christ, and to the Christian Church:

* As the BISHOP OF EXETER differs from most of the ancient Fathers only in adopting the allegorical sense of the Prophecy singly, whereas they (and among them *Jerom*, the Father of the Vulgate) understand it both literally and allegorically; he probably considered that what is known only to a few, is new to the generality; when he was apprehensive that the principal objections to his allegorical sense of the Prophecy would arise from its novelty. The Author of the *Remarks* on his Sermon (who is a declared enemy to the allegorical, or, as he calls it, *metaphorical*, interpretation of the Prophecy) seems to have understood the Bishop too literally. "We may venture to affirm," says the very learned and ingenious Preacher, "that the former and latter house in this celebrated prophecy of Haggai may, on good ground, be referred to the different states of religion under the law and the Gospel." To which the *Remarker* replies, p. 18. "that no such reference can be made without setting reason and all the known rules, whereby words are interpreted, at defiance; and his Lordship may rest assured that the Christian world as it never hath acknowledged any such interpretation, as is given to the Prophecy of Haggai in the Sermon; so it never will."

OR

or (more comprehensively) to the material building, as well as to the presence of Christ, and to the Christian Church: which was the mode of Interpretation followed by most of the ancient Fathers.

As it is not the purpose of these Remarks to discuss the application* of the Prophecy, but to examine how far the testimony of Josephus is affected by the usual application; it will be sufficient to mention, that, of those, who apply the Prophecy to the personal appearance of the Messiah, all agree that it was the *second* Temple which was to be glorified by his presence; but all do not agree in what is meant by the latter house or *second* Temple: some extending it to the Temple, which Josephus says was rebuilt by Herod; and others thinking it literally and exclusively limited to the building erected by Zerubbabel. The Advocates for the latter opinion consider Josephus's account as inconsistent with the Prophecy, and therefore affirm either that the whole of Josephus's

* It is, for the same reason, at present, taken for granted, that the common Interpretation of the Prophecy is just: the *Evidence* which occasioned the following Remarks, proceeds on this supposition: though there are very respectable authorities for supposing that the 7th and 9th verses are not accurately translated. The latter verse belongs to the present part of the Inquiry; (see sect. vi.) the former to the general application of the Prophecy.

account

account of Herod's rebuilding of the Temple is mere fiction; or that Herod only enlarged Zerubbabel's Temple, and that Josephus means no more.

The subject is certainly important and interesting. On one hand the truth of a Prophecy is concerned, which has been generally considered as a clear prediction of the Messiah: on the other, the credibility of an historian is at stake, on whose word and faith we are accustomed to build so much in proof of the prophetic and divine character of our Saviour. It is asserted that either Haggai is a false prophet, or Josephus a false historian. This is not the place § to dispute the propriety of the alternative; admitting it therefore for the sake of enquiry, the question before the reader is simply this, Whether the Prophecy of Haggai be not equally true of Herod's Temple as of Zerubbabel's. The Author of a Pamphlet lately published entitled "*Evidence that the Relation of Josephus concerning Herod's having new built the Temple at Jerusalem is either false or misinterpreted,*" declares most decidedly against the rebuilding of the Temple by Herod: and that Josephus, if he means to assert, that Herod entirely rebuilt the Temple, is guilty of wilful and direct falsehood. Whether the weight of Evidence produced be sufficient to

§ See Section V.

justify

justify the conclusions, which the Author has drawn from it, it is the business of the following Remarks freely and impartially to examine.

The first part of the Pamphlet (p. 1—38) proceeds on the supposition, that Josephus asserts (as he is commonly understood to assert) that Herod entirely took down the Temple built by Zerubbabel, and rebuilt it on new foundations: and endeavours to disprove the relation partly by positive evidence against what are considered as improbabilities and inconsistencies in the fact, and partly by collateral evidence, which is brought to invalidate the credibility of Josephus's testimony in general. The Author afterwards (p. 38—71.) abandons this supposition, and endeavours to shew, that Josephus has been misinterpreted, and does not mean to say that Herod took down Zerubbabel's Temple, and rebuilt it; but merely that he repaired it, by adding to the *length* and height of it, in order that it might be equal to Solomon's. He then proceeds to shew (p. 71 &c.), that if Zerubbabel's Temple was entirely taken down, and rebuilt by Herod, the Prophecy of Haggai was never verified. *

* The principal arguments of the Evidence appeared in the conclusion of the *Remarks* on the Sermon of the BISHOP OF EXETER: and perhaps from the resemblance of arguments, language, and manner, the reader will be disposed to think that both pieces come from the same hand.

As in the course of the following Remarks I shall take the liberty to deviate from the order of the *Evidence*, it may be proper to explain a circumstance, which might otherwise appear incompatible with an impartial review of the enquiry. The result of the *Evidence* should prove either that the relation of Josephus is false, or that it has been misinterpreted. If the Historian has been guilty of falsehood, he has not been misinterpreted: if he has been misinterpreted, and does not mean to say that Herod entirely rebuilt the temple, then, at least in this instance, he has not been guilty of falsehood. As the Author of the *Evidence* decides ultimately with the latter conclusion, to what purpose does he employ so large a share of his Pamphlet in impeaching the credibility of Josephus's testimony in order to prove a point, which it was not his intention to maintain? The heavy imputations of *wilful and direct falsehood*, of *falsifying records*, of *inconsistency*, *contradiction*, *palpable nonsense*, and *absurdity*, are clearly foreign to the purpose of the *Evidence*. The arguments therefore, which are brought to support these imputations, will not be considered under that part, which they occupy in the *Evidence*. But as the credibility of Josephus's testimony is involved in the general question, which respects
the

the application of the prophecy of Haggai, the arguments, which are brought to invalidate the testimony, will be considered after we have seen what that testimony really is. Having premised this, I have only to inform the reader, that in the *first* of the two following Sections, it is intended to examine whether the new sense in which the Author of the Evidence understands the relation of Josephus, be consistent with probability, or the authority of Scripture: and in the *second*, whether it be consistent with the usual acceptation of the words in which the account is delivered. When those points are determined, it will be time to inquire, 1. whether the rebuilding of the Temple by Herod be in itself improbable or inconsistent with other accounts in Josephus; 2. whether Josephus was likely to have falsified the account; 3. whether it be inconsistent with the usual application of the prophecy of Haggai.

SECTION I.

THE author of the *Evidence* having proposed his objections to the common Interpretation of the words of *Josephus*, which arise (he says) from the *inexplicable difficulty* and *palpable nonsense* of it, gives it as his opinion (p. 43—45. 58—61), that as both Temples were built on the same area, and as

B 2

Zerub-

Zerubbabel's Temple was shorter than Solomon's by 40 Cubits, the *αρχαίαι θεμελίαι*, which Herod removed, must have been 40 Cubits of the old foundations of Solomon's Temple, which he thinks it probable were not removed at the building of Zerubbabel's Temple, because it is not recorded that they were, but were left, he supposes, in order to be plain and indisputable evidence of the extent of Solomon's Temple, and for the future completion of the Prophecy of Haggai.

If we attend separately to the parts, which compose this Hypothesis, it cannot but strike the reader, who has looked ever so slightly into the Scripture accounts of the two Temples of Solomon and Zerubbabel, that the Hypothesis proceeds on an assumed fact, and rests ultimately on a conjecture. It proceeds on a supposition that Solomon's Temple was forty cubits longer than Zerubbabel's, and rests on a conjecture that there were forty cubits of foundations unbuilt on by Zerubbabel, which were not removed till the time of * Herod. Now if there were no such old

* " It is true," says the Author, " all this is only conjecture; but then it hath nothing improbable in it; on the contrary it hath much of probability; and in matters of this nature, where we have not the Evidence of facts to guide us, we must of necessity be guided by the evidence of probability; and in proportion as the degrees of probability are increased, is evidence strengthened." As I cannot persuade myself that there is so much probability in the conjecture as the Author himself believes, I think I shall not do it injustice by applying to it his own observation on a conjecture of Dr. HERBERT: " Thus this learned Doctor,—But what is this ?

" At

foundations, the Hypothesis is ruined: and whence is it collected that there were? because it is *not* recorded that there were *not*. An Hypothesis, which was to set aside an opinion espoused by men of the greatest learning, seems but ill-defended by an argument merely negative; which at once, I think, becomes ineffectual by the contrary supposition, that there were *no* such old foundations, because it is *not* recorded that there were. For though it is improbable, that any of the ruinous foundations of Solomon's Temple should have been left after Zerubbabel's Temple was built, and have been suffered to continue for the space of 500 years; or, (if suffered to continue from religious motives) that so remarkable a circumstance should not have been recorded; yet it is a sufficient argument to the contrary to infer that, as it is *not* recorded that they were suffered to continue, therefore they did *not* continue, consequently could not have been the foundations, which Herod removed. As the mere nature of the argument *a silentio* makes equally for two contrary suppositions, the decision, it seems, must depend, in all cases, on the weight of circumstances connected

" At best it is only a conjecture of his own: and though he
 " calls it probable, it nevertheless is very far from being so."
 Evidence, p. 3. 4.

with

with the omission. To apply this criterion to the present instance: if the foundations had been removed, as it was unnecessary to mention their removal, no argument against their removal could be drawn from the omission. But the omission of a circumstance with which so many interesting considerations must have been connected, as the preservation of these foundations, for the sake of the full completion of God's promise, carries with it a strong presumption, that no such circumstance ever existed.

But, I think, it is not merely improbable that there *should* have been any such old foundations remaining in Herod's time; it will appear, if I mistake not, from a comparative statement of the dimensions of the two temples of Solomon and Zerubbabel, that no such foundations *could* have continued. To the existence of these foundations, it was necessary that Solomon's Temple should have been 100 Cubits long, and therefore exceeded the length of Zerubbabel's by 40 Cubits. This difference, which, though essential to the truth of the new Hypothesis, is assumed in the Evidence (p. 43. 63.) unsupported by any authority; is not only unauthorized, but contradicted by Scripture, and by the most learned Commentators on the Old Testament.

The

The dimensions of Solomon's Temple (that is, of the ~~was~~ strictly so called) are described in the following verses of the sixth Ch. of the 1 Book of *Kings* 2. "And the *house* which King Solomon built for the LORD, the *length* thereof was *threescore* cubits, and the breadth thereof twenty cubits, and the height thereof thirty cubits. 15. And he built the walls of the house within* with boards of Cedar, both the floor of the house, and the walls of the cieling: and he covered them on the inside with wood, and covered the floor of the house with planks of fir. 16. And he built twenty cubits on the sides of the house, both the floor and the walls with boards of cedar: he even built them for it† within, even for the Oracle, even for the most Holy place. 17. And the House, that is the Temple before it, was *forty* cubits long. 20. And the Oracle in the forepart was *twenty* cubits in length, and twenty cubits in breadth, and twenty cubits in the height thereof." In which account the dimensions of the *exterior domus* and *interior domus*, that is of the sanctuary, and the holy of holies, given sepa-

* *The house within*, i. e. the Oracle, or the most Holy place, see v. 16. JOSEPHUS speaking of Solomon's Temple, L. VIII. c. 3. §. 2. says Διὰ τῶν τῶν οὐκ ἑνὸς, ΤΟΝ μὲν ΕΝΔΟΘΕΝ ΟΙΚΟΝ, ἑκδοσὶ πηχῶν, &c.

† *for it within*, i. e. for the house within.

rately

rately in v. 17. and 20. make up the sum of the dimensions in length in v. 2.

In the second Book of Chronicles the dimensions are described to be of the same extent. Ch. iii. v. 3. “ Now these are the things wherein Solomon was instructed for the building of the House of God. The *length* by Cubits after the first measure was *threescore* cubits, and the breadth twenty cubits. v. 8. And the most holy House, the length whereof was according to the breadth of the House, twenty cubits, and the breadth thereof twenty cubits.”

Nothing can be more determinate than the expression contained in 1 Kings vi. 2. and 2 Chronicles iii. 3. that the *length* of the House of God, or *naos*, (exclusive of the Porch, which properly speaking, was not a part of the Temple) was *sixty* cubits. JOSEPHUS says the same, *Antiq.* L. VIII. c. 3. §. 2. το μεν εν υψος ην ΕΞΗΚΟΝΤΑ πηχων. ΤΩΝ Δ' ΑΥΤΩΝ και το ΜΗΚΟΣ, ευρος δ' εκκοσι· κατα ταυτα δε αλλος ευηγεγεμενος, ισος τοις μετροις· ως ειπαι το παν υψος τω ναω πηχων εκατον και εκκοσι. RIBERA (de *Fabrica Templi*, L. I. c. 5.) in his comment on the Chapter of *Kings* above quoted, says, *Ab interiori ædificio orditur, quod proprie vocatur Domus; nam quæ circum illud erant, potius atria vocabantur; tamen tota interior domus et exterior fabrica, sæpe domus*

domus dicantur et templum. Longitudo ejus est sexaginta vulgariū cubitorum, latitudo viginti.

As it appears from what has been said, that Solomon's Temple, i. e. the *naos*, was in length only sixty cubits; and is, I believe, agreed on all hands that Zerubbabel's Temple was also *sixty* cubits in length; it is hardly necessary to quote any authority for the conclusion, which follows, that the two *naoi* were of the same length: yet for greater satisfaction, I add the opinion of RIBERA, LIGHTFOOT, and PRIDEAUX. RIBERA * says with LYRANUS, *Cyrus fabricam fieri voluisse ad exemplar prioris, nisi quod altitudinem tantam esse noluit, &c.* LIGHTFOOT (p. 1064.) says of *Ezra* vi. 3. 4. which contains the decree of Cyrus, respecting the dimensions of Zerubbabel's Temple: "We may observe that " the length is not mentioned, because that " was to be of the *former* measure." PRIDEAUX says (Anno A. C. 534.) " that the " second Temple was of the *same* dimensions " with the first, it being built on the very " same foundations, and therefore it was exactly of the same *length* and breadth." This statement of PRIDEAUX is considered by the author of the Evidence as a *palpable mistake*, p. 63, 64. because, he says, " although the

* *De Fabrica Templi*, p. 94.

“ first Temple in breadth was sixty Cubits, † “ in its *length* it was an *hundred*.” But I hope that after what has been advanced above, it is unnecessary to add any thing further in support of a statement which rests on the authority of Scripture, and is confirmed by very learned testimony, as far, at least, as respects the *length* of the two Temples.

Of the equality therefore of the two Temples of Solomon and Zerubbabel in *length* there does not seem to be any room to doubt, and consequently, as Zerubbabel’s was built on the same area as Solomon’s, there could have been no part of Solomon’s foundations unbuilt on by Zerubbabel, or removed by Herod.*

† The Author of the *Evidence* seems to be mistaken not only in considering Solomon’s Temple as forty cubits longer than Zerubbabel’s, but also in supposing that Solomon’s Temple was *sixty* Cubits in breadth. Sixty Cubits was the breadth of Zerubbabel’s Temple; but, as LIGHTFOOT says, this was *double* the breadth of Solomon’s building, the side chambers and all taken in. *Of the Temple* p. 1064. It appears from the books of *Kings* and *Chronicles*, that the breadth strictly speaking, i. e. the interior space, of Solomon’s Temple, was only 20 Cubits.

* If I might presume upon the validity of the above Observations, I think that we may account for some mistakes with respect to the dimensions of the two Temples, by supposing them to have arisen from comparing estimates which are not correlative. One estimate asserts, that Solomon’s Temple was *sixty* cubits long, which respects the interior space only. Another that the Temple was *seventy* Cubits long, which includes the Porch which was *ten* cubits long. A third, says that the Temple was 100 cubits long, which includes the *naos*, the porch, the chambers and the whole space from out to out. Therefore
it

An additional proof that Zerubbabel's Temple was not unequal in *length* to Solomon's may be collected from Herod's silence on this point, when he was endeavouring to convince the Jews of the necessity of rebuilding the Temple. It was his business to urge every circumstance of inferiority in Zerubbabel's Temple, which was likely to recommend his intentions. But as Herod takes notice only of its being inferior in *height* to Solomon's, and says nothing of its inferiority in *length*, we may reasonably conclude that it was not inferior in length. The author of the *Evidence* indeed asserts (p. 11.) that Herod in the speech just mentioned, which JOSEPHUS has given us in the *Antiq.* L. XV. c. 11. proposes to *lengthen* it, and tells the Jews that, *besides that it was not so large as Solomon's*, it wanted sixty cubits of being as high. But it is necessary to remind the reader, who has not compared the *Evidence* with JOSEPHUS, that the words printed in Italics, which are *essential* to the new Hypothesis, have no foundation in the original. The words of JOSEPHUS are, Τον γὰρ ναὸν τούτον ἀποδομήσαν μὲν τῷ μεγίστῳ θεῷ πατέρες ἡμετέροι μετὰ

it may be said in different places and with different views, that Solomon's Temple was 100 cubits in Length, and Zerubbabel's 60, and that Zerubbabel's was 100 and Solomon's 60, without supposing any difference in their *relative* dimensions.

την ἐν Βαβυλωνος ἀναστασιν. Εἰδὲ δ' αὐτῶ πρὸς το
 μέγεθος εἰς ὕψος ἑξήκοντα πηχέας which the Latin
 has rendered very justly, *Fuit quidem Tem-
 plum hoc summo Deo a patribus vestris ædifica-
 tum, cum a Babylone revertissent. Verum eis
 ad altitudinem defunt cubiti sexaginta.* Here
 is no proposal to *lengthen*,† nor any thing
 which resembles *besides that it was not so
 large*; nor any allusion to any other inferior-
 ity of dimensions but that of *height*. The
 following passage in the *Evidence* p. 50. is
 equally calculated to leave a wrong impression
 on the reader. “JOSEPHUS before” (*that
 is, at the beginning of the Chapter about
 the κατασκευῇ, for I must not yet say rebuild-
 ing, of the Temple*) “told us that Herod
 “had enlarged the dimensions of the Tem-
 “ple by adding forty cubits to its length;
 “that he had been at the expence of raising

† It should be observed, that Herod, in fact, makes no di-
 rect proposal either to *lengthen* or to *heighten* the Building: he
 only says, that it was his intention to execute some great work,
 which should be a signal monument of piety to God, and should
 be more splendid than any thing, which he had undertaken
 during his reign: That the Temple, which was built by the
 Jews, who returned from Babylon, was not so high as Solo-
 mon's by sixty cubits: but that his wealth would enable him
 to dedicate to God a perfect monument of national piety, which
 their ancestors were prevented from doing by their subjection to
 the Persians and Macedonians. But beside the inferiority in
 height, there were other reasons existing in the time of Herod,
 which after their alarm was a little subsided, might have con-
 tributed to reconcile the Jews to the demolition of the Temple:
 of which more will be said in the third Section.

“ it

“ it to a becoming height; a work which “ it seems was entrusted to the priests, &c.” If JOSEPHUS had expressed, what is here imputed to him, that Herod had *added forty cubits to the length of the Temple*, his language would have been too explicit to have admitted a doubt; and there would probably never have been any controversy about his meaning with respect to Herod’s κατασκευη and ανακτισις. But I apprehend that no part of JOSEPHUS’s relation will warrant the construction. He says in the beginning of the Chapter that it was Herod’s intention του νεων του Θεου δι’ αὐτου κατασκευασαι,* μειζω τε τον περιβολον και προς υψος αξιοπρεπιστατον εγχειν. Where κατασκευασαι does not express any comparative dimensions, that the ναος should be larger or smaller than it was before, but simply, as will appear in the next Section, *ædificare*. The enlargement here mentioned belongs merely to the περιβολος, which was to be larger and higher. I know not any other way to account for the author’s thinking that JOSEPHUS had said any thing about *enlarging* the ναος, unless by supposing that here (p. 50.) he connected together in his mind two words of the preceding passage of JOSEPHUS, which belong to two different objects, that is κατασκευασασθαι and μειζω, as he has

* So it should be read and not κατασκευασασθαι, as will be seen below.

printed

printed them p. 25. of the *Evidence*, where he says that “ Herod formed the design “ κατασκευασασθαι μὲζω τον περιβολον, of enlarg-
 “ ing the Temple of God, and of raising it
 “ to a greater and more becoming height.” Whereas JOSEPHUS says only that it was Herod’s intention τον νων κατασκευασαι *edificare*, (which does not express any enlargement of the ναος) but to build the περιβολος (or buildings, which surrounded the ναος) of a greater compass and height, μὲζω εγχειν τον περιβολον. †

But it is said (p. 63. 64.) “ When the ancients saw the foundations laid, they wept
 “ with a loud voice. If the foundations were
 “ laid exactly in the same extent, as the foundations of the former Temple, what possible inducement could they have for this ?” — Though the positive testimony of Scripture, that Zerubbabel’s Temple was equal in extent to Solomon’s, might make it unnecessary to answer any indirect evidence to the contrary, yet as it is an argument, on which the Author of the *Evidence* seems to have laid great stress, it may not be amiss to offer the following reasons for the grief of the ancients on this occasion. The inferiority of the

† In what respect the ναος built by Herod differed in its external dimensions from those of Zerubbabel’s Temple will be seen in the third Section.

materials

materials, and the present poverty of the Jews (which perhaps seemed to preclude all hopes of being able to give the Temple, that was rebuilding, the splendor and magnificence of Solomon's) might have been one reason for their sorrow. But independently of any such appearance of inferiority, the ceremony of the new Foundation must have brought to the minds of men circumstanced as the ancients of Israel were, such an association of melancholy reflections as was capable of extorting from them the most lively expression of their grief. *Many of the Priests and Levites and chief of the fathers, who were ancient men, that had seen the first house; when the foundation of this house was laid before their eyes wept with a loud voice.* EZRA iii. 12.

Occupied as their minds must have been by the remembrance of the former Temple and its glories;* its profanation and destruction, with the calamities, which attended and followed; can it be any wonder that the thoughts of the present degraded and servile state of their Nation should have made them break out into that involuntary effusion of

* We cannot have a better authority for the effect of such associations on the mind than the testimony of Euripides:

Ορι. Τιθηχ' ὁ τλημων, προς δ' απωλειται τινα.

Ιφ. Τιθηκει; ποια συμφορα; ταλαι' εγω.

Ορι. Τι δ' ιστιναξας τουτο; μιν προσηκει σοι;

Ιφ. Τον ΟΔΒΟΝ αυτου ΤΟΝ ΠΑΡΟΙΘ' αναστειν.

Iph. T. v. 548.

grief.

grief, which the sacred historian has so affectingly introduced? * Was it necessary to such an effect that there should have been any inferiority in the dimensions of the New Temple? God had indeed promised that the glory of the latter house should be greater than that of the former; but the weakness of human nature, and the despondency of old age, might easily have smothered for a moment the confidence, which was due to the promises of their God. However it seems to be purely a question of taste, which every reader will best determine by consulting his own feelings.

The following passage in the Prophecy of Haggai has been often produced as a proof of the inferiority of Zerubbabel's Temple: *Who is left among you, that saw this house in her*

* The above reasons may be confirmed by LIGHT-FOOT's opinion nearly to the same effect, which I shall transcribe because the coincidence may serve to establish the probability of the reasons. "The people that returned were 46 years in building their Temple, before they could complete it, and bring it to perfection, and yet when all was done it proved so far inferior in beauty and stateliness, to that of Solomon's, as that to those who had seen both, it was as nothing: the dimensions made not the difference, for it was twice as large again as his, (even as his was every way as large again as Moses' Tabernacle) but this wanted that sumptuousness and bravery of building that his had. And it wanted those five things which were the glory and excellency of the former, namely, the Ark, Urim and Thummim, Fire from Heaven, the cloud of Glory upon the mercy seat, and the Spirit of Prophecy: the weeping therefore of those persons that had seen the former house, at the laying of the foundation of this, was not as if they saw any lessening of the House in comparison of the former, in compass and measure, (for the founda-

first glory? and how do ye see it now; is it not in your eyes, in comparison of it, as nothing?

Ch. ii. 3. This passage has been admitted by all who have quoted it, as a manifest proof of the inferiority of Zerubbabel's Temple, at least in sumptuousness and magnificence, if not in dimension. But how it could have been admitted as a proof of either, I am at a loss to conceive. The words relate to that imperfect condition in which the Jews had been obliged to leave the building through the opposition of their enemies, and in which it had continued for near fourteen years.* In the first

" foundations promised a larger) but it was upon remembering the former, both in its magnificence and in these five excellencies, and to think of the burning of that, and it was also in comparing their present servile and poor condition, with the liberty, state, and gallantry of the Nation when the other stood " *Of the Temple*, p. 1065. B.C.

* The foundations of Zerubbabel's Temple were laid 535
The building hindered during the life of Cyrus from 534
The building interdicted by decree — 529
The building renewed under the directions of Haggai
and Zerubbabel in the second year of the reign of } 520
Darius, in the 24th Day of the sixth Month,

Y. M. D.

The Prophet first addressed the Jews in Darius's reign 2 6 1
In consequence of which the building was renewed 2 6 24
The Jews not proceeding with the vigour which }
the occasion required, the Prophet addressed } 2 7 21
them the second time soon afterwards: at which
time he made use of the words, Ch. ii. 3.

The whole building was finished 516 B.C. i. e. 6 of Darius.

The words therefore of the Prophet were spoken of the Temple about one *month* after the Jews had begun to proceed in the rebuilding, and four *years* before it was finished. It is probable that during the one year of Cyrus's favour, the *temple* was entirely rebuilt. Josephus says Herod rebuilt the *temple*, (which was 60 Cubits higher than Zerubbabel's at least in the Porch,) in a year and a half. But the *temple* bore a small proportion

D

portion

Ch. of Haggai, the Prophet says, *Is it time for you, O ye, to dwell in your cieled houses, and this house lie waste?* In this state was the building, when the Prophet Haggai was urging the Jews to renew the building. And to such a state, compared with the former glory of the temple, the words of the Prophet, *Is it not in your eyes, in comparison of it, as nothing*, would have strictly applied, even if the *dimensions* of Zerubbabel's Temple had been every way double to those of Solomon's. But from such a ruinous and desolate condition of the Temple can never, I think, be inferred the inferiority of the Temple, in any respect, when completely built.

Upon the whole there does not seem to be any room to doubt that Solomon's Temple, (that is, the *naos* strictly so called) was only sixty cubits in length; and therefore that Zerubbabel's was *equal* in **extent* to Solo-

portion to the whole *ispor*. The buildings, which surrounded the *naos* were not only subservient to purposes of Religion, but (as was before observed) formed a post of great military strength, which made the Temple at Jerusalem an object of jealousy to all the enemies of Judea. These were the buildings, which I apprehend the Jews were so often impeded from completing. Admitting therefore the *naos* to have been built; while the rest of the Temple continued to lie waste, the Prophet might well say it was as nothing in comparison with the former Temple, without implying any comparison between the dimensions of the two *naos*.

* It is sufficient for these Remarks to shew, that the Temple of Zerubbabel was at least *equal* in *length* to Solomon's, though in other respects it is said to have been much larger, except in the height of the Porch. "The breadth, says LIGHTFOOT, (p. 1064.) "doubled the breadth of Solomon's building, the side
"chambers

mon's, and of course required no additional building to make its length equal: consequently (as Zerubbabel's Temple was built on the same area as Solomon's) that the foundations, which were removed by Herod, could not † have been any of the old foundations of Solomon's Temple, as the words of JOSEPHUS are understood by the Author of the *Evidence*. And though from this conclusion an inference necessarily follows, that the foundations removed by Herod, as they were not of Solomon's Temple, could have been no other than the foundations of Zerubbabel's, and therefore that Herod's Temple was entirely new and different from Zerubbabel's, as JOSEPHUS has been usually understood; yet that nothing may be wanting to satisfy the objections which have been brought by the Author of the *Evidence* against the usual Interpretation of JOSEPHUS, they shall be considered in the following Section.

“ chambers and all taken in. The height was double to the height of Solomon's, as it is expressed in the book of Kings, and as indeed the height of the Temple was, though the Porch were higher.” And Bp. NEWCOMB (in his excellent commentary on the Twelve Minor Prophets, p. 169.) accedes to the opinion, that Solomon's Temple was inferior to Zerubbabel's in point of *magnitude*.

† The Hypothesis of the *Evidence* depends on the supposed inferiority of Zerubbabel's Temple to Solomon's in length, “ It is true,” says the Author, (p. 62.) “ that which would destroy the whole of what is here suggested, is the observation of the learned Dr. PRIDEAUX,—that the second Temple was of the same dimensions as the first.” See before, p. 17, 18. of these Remarks.

S E C T I O N II.

THE chief argument, (we are told p. 38.) in proof of Herod's having entirely new built the Temple is drawn from these words : * *Ανελων δε τας αρχαιους θεμελιους, και καταβαλομενος ετερους, επ' αυτων τον καιον ηγειρε, μηκει μιν εκατον οντα πηχων &c.* " Nothing, it is thought can be more plain, more intelligible, and more positive, than these words. " If Herod took away all the old foundations, and built a Temple upon new ones, what more decisive determination can there be of his having new built the Temple ? " It must be acknowledged, if the words are to be interpreted as they generally are interpreted, nothing can be more decisive. " But let us enquire, whether the words are truly interpreted or not."

As the question here does not regard the probability or improbability of the fact, but merely the meaning of Josephus's words in his relation of it, nothing can be more just than the appeal which is made to the *words* of the Historian. And if language has any

* See *Excerptum ex Josepho*, subjoined to these Remarks, p. 8.
certain

certain laws and analogies, such an appeal, it should seem, must admit of a clear decision. It would be fortunate for the cause of truth, especially in all religious inquiries, if the grammatical force of words were oftener made the criterion of dispute. * The Author of the Evidence seems to have been aware of the propriety of such a test, as appears not only from the passage just quoted, but from the arguments which he grounds on the force of words in several passages of the Evidence. And yet immediately after the above passage he most unexpectedly deserts this only legitimate test in determining the Historian's meaning, and, as a proof that Josephus could not mean, what he is usually understood to mean, alleges the inconsistency between the obvious sense of the passage, and Herod's proposal to the Jews, " which, says the Evidence, " was to raise and lengthen " the Temple, as if Herod did not know " that a house might be lengthened without " pulling it down." The real meaning of Josephus in this passage, and the rest of the account, must be ascertained by the usual

* Utinam essem bonus Grammaticus ! sufficit enim ei qui auctores omnes probe vult intelligere, esse bonum Grammaticum. Porro quicumque doctos viros, Grammaticos vocant, sunt ipsi indoctissimi ; idque semper observabis. Non aliunde diffidia in religione dependent, quam ab ignoratione Grammaticæ. *Scaligerana*, p. 86. ed. *Tan. Fabri*.

acceptation

acceptation of the words, in which the account is delivered. Whether Josephus is consistent in the different parts of his relation, and whether he ought to have given a more circumstantial detail of the demolition and rebuilding, † are questions *nec loci hujus nec temporis*. It appears however from what has been already said (p. 20, &c.) that Herod in his proposal to the Jews says nothing of *lengthening* the Temple : which is a sufficient answer to the imputed inconsistency.

But to proceed with the words of the passage. “ Herod,” says the Historian, “ having removed the old foundations, and laid “ others, he built on them a Temple of one “ hundred cubits in length” &c. As Herod in the passage immediately preceding this declares his intention of taking down the Temple, nothing can, it seems, more definitely express, that Herod entirely took it down and rebuilt it. It is objected however, “ if the foundations removed were Zerubbabel’s, why does the historian say *αρχαίς θεμελίς*, and not *τὰς παλ. θεμελίς*?” -- If Josephus had said *ανειων δὲ τὰς θεμελίς* there could have been no room to doubt that *θεμελίους* were the foundations of the Temple, which Herod had

† P. 40.

just before proposed to take down. In so obvious an ellipsis it would never have been asked, why he did not say *τα ναυ θεμελιαις*: because *θεμελιαις* could not have been supposed to mean foundations, which had never been mentioned. But “why must the foundations “that then were, be called *αρχαιαις*? *Αρχαιαις* “seems to imply that the foundations through “the injuries of time were decayed and worn “out; which could not possibly have been the “case here; as by the fabrick’s having continued upon them, they had been preserved “from injury: so that this likewise in the “common mode of interpretation appears to “be an inexplicable difficulty in the Historian’s account.” The difficulty, I believe, is all on the side of the “Evidence.” *Αρχαιαις* is not applied to the foundations that *then were*, but the foundations, which *had been removed*. They are called so in consequence of their removal, and in opposition to the *ε νεωι* or new foundations: not as if they had been decayed and worn out by the injuries of time; for *αρχαιαις*, I apprehend, is never used to signify any other circumstance of time but priority in the order of events. In Xenophon’s *Oeconomicus*, (which even in the present state of the Agricultural art deserves to be read for the honourable rank in which it places the *first* of arts, and for the excellent precepts which

which it gives of rural and domestic economy) Ischomachus discoursing with Socrates on the improvement of estates, says that
 “ his father and himself had improved many
 “ estates very much beyond the value which
 “ they bore before they came into their
 “ hands :” *Εν γὰρ ἰδίῃ, εἶφη, ὦ Σωκράτης, ὅτι τῆς*
ἀρχαίας τιμῆς πολλοὺς πολλαπλασίῃς χώρους ἀξιούσ
ῆκεῖς ἤδη ἐποίησαμιν. *Ἀρχαίας τιμῆς* does not mean
 their ancient value, the value of very remote
 times, (for, such a difference of value, Ischo-
 machus would probably not have thought
 any proof of their skill) but the value which
 the estates had in the hands of those who
 possessed them *immediately before* the Ischo-
 machi. So *ἀρχαῖοι θεμελῖοι* means merely the
 foundations which were, before the *ἑτέροι* had
 been laid.

Another objection against the common in-
 terpretation consists in an opinion that in the
 words *τὸν ναὸν ἡγάγε, ναὸν* does not mean the
 Temple, nor any part of it, but something
 which had no relation to it ; which, it seems,
 might have been built on the new founda-
 tions without destroying the Temple of Ze-
 rubbabel. “ We all know, (it is said p. 59.)
 “ that in the use of the Historian the word
 “ *ναὸς* is applied to a part, or even an appendage
 “ of the Temple, as well as to the whole
 “ Temple. Moreover it is remarkable that
 “ he

“ he himself tells us that the word in its
 “ true and strict acceptation is applicable
 “ only to the Sanctuary, of which he says
 “ ὁ ναὸς ἐν τούτῳ, and that Herod was prohibited
 “ from having any thing to do with that,
 “ therefore when he says Herod τοῦ ναοῦ ἡγεῖται
 “ he means something that was not the sanc-
 “ tuary ; consequently in the passage here re-
 “ ferred to τοῦ ναοῦ doth not signify the whole
 “ Temple. But if θεμελίους may not signify
 “ the foundations of the whole, much less
 “ may it signify the foundations of a part of
 “ the Temple.—Therefore it hath no rela-
 “ tion at all to the foundations of the Tem-
 “ ple then standing, &c.”

From this then we are to conclude, and,
 it is said, on the authority of Josephus him-
 self, that the word *naos*, besides the meaning
 of the *Temple*, signifies also a *part* of the
 Temple, and even an *appendage* ; but that
 strictly speaking it means *only* the *sanctuary* ;
 and yet that in the present passage it neither
 means the Temple nor the Sanctuary, nor any
 part of the Temple, but some building which
 had no relation to the Temple. It seems al-
 most unnecessary to examine an argument de-
 pending on an interpretation, which requires
 such concessions. Beside that the want of re-
 ferences to the passages in Josephus makes it
 difficult to judge how far he is answerable

E

for

for what is imputed to him. However to take the argument as it stands. It is said that Josephus tells us that *ναος* in its strict sense is applicable only to the Sanctuary; and that Herod not being a Priest was prohibited from *having any thing to do* with the Sanctuary; therefore when Josephus says *ηγείρει τον ναον*, he must mean something which was not the sanctuary. The conclusion would be allowed, if the premises were just. But there is a fallacy which lies in the latitude of the expression that Herod was prohibited from *having any thing to do* with the Sanctuary. The words of Josephus are: * Τῶτων εἰς πόλιν τῶν τριῶν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρώδης ἐποίησεν· ἐκεκώλυτο γὰρ ἑκ τῶν ἱερῶν. Whatever be the right reading and sense of the first words of this passage, the prohibition extends only to his *entering* the court of the Priests, (in which the *ναος* was) which it was unlawful for any but Priests to enter, in consequence of which the *ναος* was built by the Priests. But though he was thus prevented from attending personally to the building of the *ναος*, as he did to the *ἐξω περιβολαι*, it did not prevent him from supplying the Jews with the materials, and expense of building it: which is all that is necessary to the sense of *ηγείρει τον ναον*. It is obvious that *ηγείρει* does

* *Excerptum*, p. 20. Concerning this passage see more in the advertisement prefixed to the *Excerptum*.

not

not mean *suis manibus extruxit* , but, in the usual historical sense, *extruendum curavit* , to which his presence was not necessary.

As to the limited sense of *vaos* , which, we are told, Josephus says is applicable to the *sanctuary only* , I have not met with any passage in Josephus, which contains an *express declaration* of any sense of the word *vaos* , much less a particular limitation of it to what is here supposed to be its *true and strict* meaning. The passage of Josephus, which the author of the Evidence had in view, was, probably, the following, the conclusion of which contains the words quoted in the Evidence :
 Εσωτερῶ δὲ κακεινοῦ γυναιξὶν ἀβάτον ἦν τὸ ἱερόν· ἐκεῖνον δ' ἐνδοτερον τρίτον, ὅπῃ τοῖς ἱερευσὶν εἰσελθεῖν ἐξόν ἦν μορῆς· ὁ ἄλλος ἐν τούτῳ. *Adbuc interiorius erat sanctuarium quo fœminæ non intrabant. Et porro interiorius erat tertium quo non nisi sacerdotibus licebat intrare. Hæc erat ades.* So runs the Latin translation : but in the translation there are two errors, which the Author of the Evidence seems to have inadvertently adopted ; one of the Translator, and the other, I presume, of the press. The first consists in translating *ἱερόν* *sanctuarium* instead of *atrium* .*

* *Ἱερόν* in its largest sense meant the whole space consecrated to the service of God. But when limited, as in *ἱερόν πρῶτον, δεύτερον, τρίτον* , it means the first *court* &c. The *vaos* containing the *ἅγιος ναός* (or *ἁγία σκηνή* , as it is called by St. Paul) and the *ἀδυτοῖς* (or *ἁγία ἁγίων*) was the *house of God* properly so called : it was the most sacred and therefore the principal part of the whole.

This error, which has descended through Hudson's edition into Havercamp's, should have been corrected from Ribera's excellent treatise de *Fabrica Templi*, lib. I. c. 33. or Lempereur's learned and useful commentary on the *Babylonish Talmud*, cap. ii, sect. iii, p. 45. 53. The other error is in the translation of ὁ ναὸς ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ (ἱερὸν αὐτῷ) *Hæc erat ædes*, which makes *naos* equivalent to *sanctuary*; and seems to have been the foundation of the true and strict sense attributed to *naos*. But as the meaning of ὁ ναὸς ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ is *in hoc* (atrio) *erat ædes*, it is but justice to the translator to suppose, that *hæc erat ædes* is an error of the press for *hic* (in hoc atrio) *erat ædes*. Therefore we may still believe till better authority is produced, that *naos* in the language of Josephus means the building containing the Sanctuary and Holy of Holies, but not the Sanctuary exclusively: and that Herod's εὐσεβεῖν τοῦ ναοῦ was not incompatible with the prohibition, which made it unlawful for him to enter the court, in which it was situated.

But it seems, the principal terms in the description of Herod's undertaking are ex-

whole ἱερὸν, for which all the rest was built; and as such is often used for the whole. Josephus distinguishes between ἱερὸν and ναὸς, where he says that the ναὸς was built in a year and a half, and the ἱερὸν τοῦ ναοῦ or the rest of the ἱερὸν in eight years (*Excerptum* p. 20.) Concerning the distinction between ναὸς and ἱερὸν, which is of great consequence in every question relating to the Temple, its parts, and dimensions, see the advertisement prefixed to the *Excerptum ex Josepho*.

pressive

pressive not of new building, but *of repairs*, and *additions* only, and buildings *relating to the Temple*, such as *κατασκευασαι, επικατασκευαι,* and *τα περι τον ναον*. It is obvious that Josephus's meaning must be determined by the force of such terms as *κατασκευαζεν, κατασκευη, ανακτισις,* and *εγειρεν*, which are applied by the Historian to Herod's building. And if the Author of the Evidence had produced any instances from Josephus or other Greek Authors, in which these words had been used in the sense of *repairs* and *additional building*, it would have afforded some colour to the interpretation, which he has given of them. But no such instances are adduced. "But let us attend a little," says the Author (p. 25.) "to the account he gives us in his Antiquities B. xv. c. 11.* In the 18th year of his reign Herod formed the design *κατασκευασαδαι μεγα τον περιβολον*, of enlarging the Temple of God, and of raising it to a greater and becoming height; but finding that the people did not readily concur with him in approving his design, he assembled them together and addressed them in a formal harangue. In words to this effect the Historian introduces the account he is going to give of Herod's operations on the Temple, where observe that he neither

* See the *Excerptum*, initio.

says

“ says nor intimates that Herod had formed
 “ a design of taking down the old Temple,
 “ and building a new one in its room ; for
 “ though interpreters have rendered κατασ-
 “ κευασαδαι *ædificare*, *ut ædificatum iret* &c. the
 “ word here hath no such signification.

To this representation of Josephus there are several objections. In the first place the *ποιος* is not noticed, which Josephus distinguishes from the περιβολος. Which distinction is necessary to the right sense of the passage, and useful to the whole narrative. (2.) Κατασκευασαδαι is combined with μειζω which gives it the sense of *enlarging* ; whereas in the original it is connected with τον νεων simply, without any term to change its signification from the general one of *building*. (3.) The other objection is to the *petitio principii* contained in the gratuitous assertion, that κατασκευασαδαι “ here has no such signification as *ædificare*,” without producing a single instance of κατασκευαζειν or κατασκευαζε-δαι in the sense of *repairing*. In all the passages which I have met with, where it is not connected with some term expressive of enlargement, it uniformly signifies *de novo facere*, *ædificare*, &c. Isaiah Ch. XLV. v. 7. in the Septuagint Translation, εγω ο κατασκευασας Φως, και ποιησας σκοτος. Jos. Ant. L. III. c. 6. says of the building of the tabernacle, εκ γαρ τριαυτης υλης κατασκευαζε την σκηνην. L. x. c. viii. §. 5. he says

says of the destruction of Solomon's Temple ἐνέπρηθη δὲ ὁ ναὸς μῆλα τριακοσια ἐτη καὶ ἑξ-δομηκοντα καὶ μηνας ἑξ καὶ δέκα ἡμέρας, ἀφ' ἧ κατεσκευαώθη. In the eleventh Book where he gives an account of the rebuilding of the Temple by Zerubbabel, he says Ch. II. §. 1. Παρέκαλυν τὴς σάραπας καὶ τὴς ἐπιμελομένους ἐμπο-διζέειν τὴς Ἰουδαίους πρὸς τε τὴν τῆς πόλεως ἀναστάσιν καὶ τὴν τοῦ ναοῦ κατασκευὴν. C. 4. §. 1. κατασκευ-ασαν θυσιάστηριον. Ib. §. 3. αὐτῶν προσαχθέντων καὶ ἀσ-κεύασαν τὸν ναόν. In which passages κατασκευάζειν et κατασκευῆ are obviously used for ἀνακλίσειν and ἀνακτισίς. These instances will sufficiently ex-plain why (see *Evidence* p. 31.) in the follow- ing passage it was unnecessary to use ἀνακτισίς instead of κατασκευῆ. L. XVII. c. 6, Herod remonstrating with the Jews for their ingrati- tude, as he thought it, in demolishing the golden eagles, enumerates the services which he had done their nation, and amongst the rest mentions τοῦ ναοῦ τὴν κατασκευὴν, ὡς μεγάλοις τελεσι τοῖς αὐτοῖς γενοίῃα, which is usually translated *utque templum magnis suis sumptibus extruxisset*; but which in the *Evidence* is translated “ how- “ largely he hath contributed towards the “ repairs of the Temple :” conformably enough to the Hypothesis of the *Evidence*, but how accurately the preceding remarks, I think, will shew.*

* In the above instances the reader will observe the middle form κατασκευαώσαι is never used : and that where the passive form

The following passage * is considered as a decisive proof not only, that Herod did not entirely new build the Temple, but that the Historian *no where* says he did, but the contrary. Evidence p. 42, 43. Περιλαμβάνει δὲ καὶ ταῖς μεγίσταις τὸν ναὸν ἀπαντα, πρὸς τὴν ἀναλογίαν ἐπιτηδίων, καὶ τὰς δαπάνας τῶν πρὶν ὑπερβαλλομένων ὥς οὐκ ἄλλος τις εἶδκει τὸν ναὸν ἐπικεκοσμηκεναι. I shall save the reader the trouble of turning to the Evidence, by producing the Author's reflection at large. The passage is first translated thus: "He surrounded the whole Temple
 " with vast porticos, taking the utmost care
 " that they should be in very exact proportion;
 " and outdoing all that ever went before him
 " in the sums he expended on the occasion,
 " infomuch that not one of his predecessors
 " seems to have *added so much to the beauty of*
 " *the temple as he did.*" To this translation the Author adds the following observations.
 " Who is able to reconcile this passage with
 " common sense, if Herod had really taken
 " down the whole of Haggai's Temple, and
 " built a new one in its room? How is it

form is used, it is in the passive sense. To those instances add κατασκευασας L. XV. c. 11. §. 5. κατασκευασιν and κατασκευαδῃ ibid. §. 7. Other instances the reader will meet with in the account of Solomon's Temple L. VIII. c. 3. Therefore I think there is no doubt that in the beginning of C. 11. L. xv. it should be read κατασκευασαι, and not κατασκευαδαι with the old editions, nor κατασκευασαδαι with Hudson, &c.

* Excerptum p. 10.

" possible

“ possible that the Historian could say this, if
 “ in the compass of only a few preceding lines
 “ he thought he had insinuated that Herod
 “ had new built the Temple. His predecessors
 “ could not possibly have added any thing
 “ to the beauty of the Temple, if it was all
 “ of Herod’s building. And he could not
 “ possibly have *added more to the beauty of the*
 “ *Temple* than any of his predecessors, if
 “ there was no Temple at that time standing
 “ which had been beautified by his predecessors.
 “ sors. But if he entirely built the Temple,
 “ there certainly was none; and then what
 “ meaning is there in the above words? And
 “ therefore to rescue the Historian from such
 “ palpable nonsense, it must be absolutely
 “ pronounced that Herod did not entirely new
 “ build the Temple, and that the Historian
 “ no where says he did, but the contrary.”

This is indeed pressing the Evidence most
 forcibly on the judgement of the reader; and
 I am disposed to think, more decisively than
 any *single* passage, unless much more explicit
 than the present, will warrant, when not sup-
 ported by the general tenor of a whole narra-
 tive. But what shall we say, if the *palpable*
nonsense produced by the imputed inconsis-
 tency of this passage with the opinion, that
 Herod new built the Temple, should not be
 the nonsense of the original? To say that

F

“ Herod

“ Herod so far outdid all his predecessors that
 “ not one of them seems to have added so
 “ much to the beauty of the Temple as he
 “ did.” i. e. that Herod did *so much more*
than all his predecessors, that none of them
 seems to have done *so much as he*, is certainly
 such nonsense as may reasonably make any
 one suspect that the translation can not con-
 vey the meaning of Josephus. The translation
 in the Evidence is indeed countenanced by
 the Latin : “ sumptibus majores superans, ut
 “ nec quisquam alius videretur *ita* Templum
 “ exornasse.” The nonsense arises from the
 comparison *ita* and *so much* : in the words of
 the original there is nothing corresponding
 to these terms ; all comparison is excluded.
 The meaning of Josephus, if I mistake not,
 is, that Herod so far exceeded the expense of
 all his predecessors, that no other person
 seemed to have contributed at all to the or-
 nament of the Temple : i. e. though his
 predecessors the Hasamonzæan Kings had been
 great benefactors to the Temple, especially
 Judas Maccabæus, who built a new altar,
 and seems nearly to have rebuilt the ~~temple~~ after
 the profanation by Antiochus : yet Herod so
 far exceeded the expense and munificence of
 his predecessors, as to eclipse all their bene-
 factions and services. Why Josephus did not
 distinguish the different structures of Zerub-
babel

babel and Herod as different Temples, but called both *the Temple*, I shall endeavour to shew, when we come to consider whether the rebuilding of the Temple by Herod is incompatible with the Prophecy of Haggai. In the mean while I beg leave to refer the reader to the Dissertation of Ernesti, printed at the end of the Extract from Josephus, which is subjoined to these Remarks.

But it will perhaps still be urged that the concluding passage of Josephus's account† shews that Herod's operations were confined to *repairs* and *additional buildings*: Τα μὲν οὖν περὶ τὸν ναὸν ἐξωκαδομήθη τούτου τοῦ τρόπου. "If Herod took down the Temple and new built it, this passage, says the Author of the Evidence, must mean, "In this manner was the Temple new built and completely finished:" and as it is impossible that the words can so mean, therefore it is plain that Herod did not take down the Temple and rebuild it." In this reasoning neither the consequence nor the conclusion can be admitted. It is not necessary to the demolition and rebuilding of the Temple, that the words should have the meaning ascribed to them. The distinction between the ναὸς and περιβόλοι has been already adverted to: according to these diffe-

* Evidence p. 49, 50. et Excerptum, p. 22.

tent objects the description of Herod's operations is divided into two parts. The account of the ναος and of the entrance to it, is given in few words at the beginning of the third Section: *Ανέλκων δὲ τοὺς ἀρχαίους θεμελίους τὴν ναοσκευάσθαι ἤν.* From thence to the end of the fifth section is an account of the *τοιαῦτα μεγάλα* the courts, &c. which surrounded the ναος. As the account of the ναος does not extend beyond the first part of the description, he says in that part *ἐκδομένηθῃ ὁ ναός, &c.* And as all beside the ναος was *τὰ περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ*, he concludes the remaining account of the *τοιαῦτα μεγάλα* &c. with *τὰ μὲν οὖν περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ ἐκδομένηθῃ τούτου τοῦ τρόπου.* The Author of the Evidence not attending, as it seems, to the distinction which Josephus makes between the ναός and *περιβόλαι* i. e. *τὰ περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ*, or to the course of the description as it regards those different objects, asks (p. 50.) why in the concluding passage the Historian does not say *ὁ μὲν οὖν ναός* (instead of *τὰ περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ*) *ἐκδομένηθῃ τούτου τοῦ τρόπου.*

According then to the division of the relation the obvious sense of *τὰ μὲν οὖν περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ ἐκδομένηθῃ τούτου τοῦ τρόπου* is, *Thus were the buildings which surrounded the ναός completely built.* However it is not improbable that the expression *τὰ περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ* includes the ναός as well as *τὰ περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ οἰκήματα* in the same manner

as

ἀς αἱ περὶ Σολομῶντος is used for ὁ Σολομῶντος καὶ οἱ
 πατρὶς αὐτοῦ οἰκοδομοῦντες and τὰ ἀμφὶ αὐτοῦ for αὐτοῦ καὶ
 τὰ ἀμφὶ αὐτοῦ ὄντα, a mode of expression well
 known from elementary books on Greek
 idioms. The reader will perhaps be more dis-
 posed to admit this extended sense of τὰ περὶ
 τοῦ καιροῦ, when he considers that the description
 of the περιβολοί, στοά, &c. ends with the fifth
 section; and that the chief of what intervenes
 between that and the conclusion belongs to the
 παρῶν. The passage immediately preceding does;
 Λέγεται δὲ κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν καιρὸν οἰκοδομουμένου τοῦ
 ναοῦ &c. It seems therefore that the conclu-
 sion of the whole account should extend to
 every part of it.

The passage just referred to, Λέγεται δὲ κατ'
 ἐκεῖνον τὸν καιρὸν οἰκοδομουμένου τοῦ ναοῦ τὰς μὲν ἡμέρας
 αὐτὸν ἔσθαι, ἐν δὲ ταῖς νύξιν γινέσθαι τοὺς ὁμήρους, ὥς μὲν
 παρὰ τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν παρεδόκει, affords to the author of the Evi-
 dence another objection. The concluding
 words καὶ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν παρεδόκει
 he translates, *and this tradition our forefathers
 have handed down to us*. Such language he
 thinks Josephus would not have used of an
 event so recent as the rebuilding of the Tem-
 ple would have been, if Herod had really re-
 built it. "Is it usual," he says, "for people
 "to talk of events as it were of yesterday
 "being handed down to them by tradition?"
 This objection derives its speciousness from
 the

the translation which the author has thought proper to give in the Evidence. To *hand down by tradition* may not, in English, be consistent with an account delivered from parent to child, or from one generation to the next: but *παραδιδόναι* is used by the Greek writers in both those senses, and even to express the *tradition* of any account from one writer to another equal and contemporary. In Lucian, vol. i. p. 183. (ed. Hemsterhuis.) Socrates, speaking of Halcyon, says, *κλεις δὲ μυθῶν οἷον παρῑδοσαν πατερες, τοιοῦτο καὶ παῖσιν ἐμοῖς, ὡς ὄρνι θρηνην μελωδῇ, παραδῶσω τῶν σὺν ὕμνων περὶ.* i. e. in the words of Dr. Carr, † “ But “ the tradition, which I have received from “ my parents concerning thy songs, o bird “ melodious melancholy, I will deliver down “ to my children.” The fables alluded to were ancient, but the act of *tradition* expressed by *παραδιδόναι* in this passage, was only from parents to children. St. Luke uses *παραδιδόναι* concerning the Gospel, which he received from those who were eye-witnesses of our Saviour’s miracles. *Καθὼς παρῑδοσαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς αὐτοπταὶ καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου.*

We have now seen all the objections produced in evidence *against the usual interpretation* of Josephus’s account of Herod’s Tem-

† Translation of Lucian Vol. II. p. 338, 339.

ple;

ple ; and derived from expressions in the account, which the Author thought inconsistent with the opinion of Herod's demolition and rebuilding of the Temple. From the remarks on those objections it appears, I think, that they do not in any degree invalidate the opinion, which they oppose. If the remarks are founded, it will not be necessary to dwell long on those expressions and circumstances in the Historian's account, which may be brought to *corroborate the usual interpretation*. But first, of the terms which relate to the demolition.

1. When Herod had addressed himself to the Jews, they were struck with consternation at his proposals ; and were anxious lest he should attempt to take down the whole Temple, (καταλυσαι το παν εργον) and not be able to complete his designs. He consoled them by assurances that he would not take down the Temple (καθαρισειν τον νεων) before he had prepared every thing for accomplishing his intentions. As το παν εργον cannot mean less than τον νεων nor τον νεων, it should seem, than the whole νεως. It will follow that καταλυσαι το παν εργον and καθαρισειν τον νεων cannot express less than the demolition of the whole νεως. However the author of the Evidence supposes that there is a difference between the ναος and the *whole ναος* ; but does
not

not establish the difference by sufficient authority. The supposition is founded on a false punctuation of the passage before quoted, p. 46. Περιλαμβάνει δὲ καὶ σοαῖς μεγίσταις τὸν ναὸν ἅπαντα, πρὸς ἀναλογίαν ἐπιτηδεύων, &c. Before I had seen Hudson's note, I had corrected the punctuation, as it is there proposed, περιλαμβάνει δὲ καὶ σοαῖς μεγίσταις τὸν ναὸν, ἅπαντα πρὸς ἀναλογίαν ἐπιτηδεύων, and for the following reasons: (1) In the first place because, if ναὸς mean the *naos* properly so called, then ἅπας is unnecessarily joined with ναὸς, for it can add nothing to its signification. The στοαῖ which *surrounded* the ναὸς could not have surrounded less than the *whole*. (2) If ναὸς ever mean the whole ἱερόν, (as it certainly sometimes does,) when connected with ἅπας it cannot mean less. But as the whole ἱερόν *includes* the στοαῖ, it would be absurd to say that the στοαῖ *surrounded* the ἱερόν. (3) But while ἅπας is either unnecessarily or absurdly joined with ναὸς, it is absolutely necessary, I think, to the construction of the following words, πρὸς ἀναλογίαν ἐπιτηδεύων: *scilicet* ἅπαντα π. α. ἐπιτηδεύων, *omnia summa arte et ratione elaborans*. ΕΠΙΤΗΔΕΥΩΝ, I believe, always requires its subject to be expressed: as in Lucian, vol. i. p. 463. (ed. Hemsterhuis) τοὺς τε τὴν δόξαν ἀποβαλλομένους, αὐτῆς ἐνέκα πάντα ἐπιτηδεύοντας. The extraordinary remark on τὰ παν ἔργον (p. 47.) requires no animadversion.

Nothing

Nothing can more completely express the entire demolition of a building than *ανελων τους θεμελιους*. And it is not credible that these *θεμελιοι* can mean any other foundations than of the Temple, which he says in the passage immediately preceding, it was Herod's intention *καθαιρησεν*. If the Historian had meant any part of Solomon's foundations unbuilt on by Zerubbabel, he would not have omitted to mention somewhere that such foundations had been suffered to remain sacred and undisturbed.

2. The following terms as unequivocally denote *rebuilding* and *new structures*, *ανακτισις*, *οικοδομειν*, *εγειρειν*, *κατασκευαζειν*. Of *κατασκευαζειν* enough has been already said. Of *οικοδομειν* and *εγειρειν* it is unnecessary to produce instances: but for the latter see Ernesti's Dissertation, p. 32. Of *ανακτισις* take the following instance. Josephus says * that when the *ναος* was finished by the Priests the people with great joy gave thanks to God, first for the expedition with which it had been finished, and then for the zeal with which Herod had promoted its completion; and celebrated the *rebuilding* with every expression of festivity and satisfaction. Του δε ναε δια των ιερεων οικοδομηθενιος ενιαυτω και μηνσιν εχ, απας ο λαος επληρωθη χαρας και του ταχους πρωτον μεν τω θεω τας ευχα-

* Excerptum, p. 6.

πιστίας ἐποιούντο, μετὰ δὲ καὶ τῆς προθυμίας τοῦ βασιλεως, εορταζόντες, καὶ κατευφημούντες τὴν ἀνακτισιν.

3. It is evident from several circumstances in Josephus's account that he meant that the whole structure of the ναὸς was new built by Herod. (1) The *length of the ναὸς* erected by Herod makes it impossible that it should have been an addition to Zerubbabel's building. Josephus says that Herod having removed the old foundations, and laid others, he built on them the ναὸς of *one hundred cubits in length* &c. ἐπ' αὐτῶν (θεμελίων) τὸν ναὸν ἤγειρε, μήκει μὲν ἑκατὸν οὐκὰ πηχῶν. Ἡγεῖρε cannot mean *be completed out* to the length of 100 cubits; but he raised new from the ground, on these new foundations, a building of 100 cubits, which he could not have said if Herod had added only *forty* cubits; or if he had not removed Zerubbabel's building for it. (2) The *length of time*, in which Herod's structure was building, shews that it could not have been mere repairs. The ναὸς was one year and a half in building; and the περιβολαὶ ἢ τὰ περὶ τὸν ναὸν, eight years. The Temple of Solomon was built in seven years. * (3) It should be remembered that in the former part of his reign he had built a palace in Jerusalem, within and about which were so many splendid edifices as to give it the appearance

* 1 Kings vi. 38.

of a city. He built also the city of Cæsarea, with a spacious harbour; and beside other memorable works he built a large and beautiful Temple at Samaria, ναον ἐν αὐτῷ μεγαθεῖ καὶ καλλεῖ των ἐλλογιμασιων. † And yet after all these great works, in his address to the Jews he says it was his intention to execute some work of more splendor than all his former acts; and which should immortalize his memory. This he could not have said if he had thought only of repairs and improvements. (4) In this harangue he lays great stress on his own prosperity and wealth, and the favour of the Romans, as great advantages to his undertaking, very consistently with the magnificent promise which he had made, but not with mere improvements and additions. (5) It is not probable that merely repairing and adding to the Temple would have satisfied the ambitious munificence of Herod: or (6) that the Jews would have been struck with such consternation and solicitude about any thing less than the design of taking down the whole Temple.

To what has been said, I shall subjoin a translation of Josephus's account of this transaction, and leave the impression of the narrative with the reader, as the last argument

† Antiquit. L. XV. c. 8, 9.

for the common opinion, that Josephus meant to say that Herod entirely took down the Temple and rebuilt it. “ In the 18th year of his reign Herod undertook a great work, which was to build the Temple, or House, of God at his own expense, and to erect the buildings which surrounded it on a larger scale and greater height than they were before, thinking that the execution of such a work would be more glorious, as it was, than all his former acts, and would immortalize his memory. But hearing that the people were not disposed to concur with his intentions, he thought it prudent to convene an assembly, and address them on the subject of his intentions, before he began the work.” In his harangue, after hinting to them the various services which he had performed for their nation, he says that the undertaking, which he now meditated, would be more splendid than all his former acts, and would be a signal monument of piety to God: That the Temple then standing, which was built by their ancestors after their return from Babylon, was not so high as Solomon’s by sixty cubits: That they had been prevented from giving it the same height as Solomon’s by the orders of Cyrus and Darius, which had limited the form of the building; and by the oppression of the

Macc-

Macedonians to whom they had been subject; But that as he was in possession of the kingdom, and had great wealth, with a large revenue; and at the same time possessed the friendship and favour of the Romans, who were masters of the world; he intended, in return for the kingdom, which he possessed by the will and goodness of God, to dedicate to Him a full and complete offering of piety and gratitude. † “ The people were struck
 “ with astonishment; and were dejected at
 “ the prospect of so hopeless an undertaking.
 “ They were under the most anxious apprehension lest he should take down the whole
 “ Temple (καταλυσαι το παν εργον) and not be able
 “ to compleat his intentions; and were confirmed in their fear by the difficulty and
 “ magnitude of his designs. From these apprehensions the king relieved them by assurances that he would not take down the
 “ Temple (καθαιρησειν τον νεων), before every
 “ thing was prepared sufficient to completely
 “ rebuild it (εις την συντελειαν.) And he did not
 “ falsify his promise. For he got ready a thousand waggons for carrying stones, and selected ten thousand of the most skilful
 “ workmen, and purchased ιερατικαι στολαι for

† τιλαιαν ευσεβειαν as opposed to the ατιλης ευσεβεια of their ancestors.

“ a thou-

“ a thousand priests, and had them instructed
 “ some in the art of building, and others in
 “ carpenters and smiths work : and as soon
 “ as every thing was prepared, he began the
 “ building. After he had removed the old
 “ foundations and laid others, he built on
 “ them the ναος of one hundred cubits in
 “ length, and one hundred and twenty in
 “ height. The ναος was built of a white du-
 “ rable stone &c. * * * The gates which led
 “ into the ναος he ornamented &c. * * * He
 “ surrounded the ναος with immense porticos,
 “ constructing them on the exactest princi-
 “ ples of art and proportion ; and so far ex-
 “ ceeded the expence of his predecessors, that
 “ no other person seemed to have had any
 “ share in the structure and ornament of the
 “ Temple. † * * * Herod confined his per-
 “ sonal attention to the στοαι and ἐξω περιβολοι,
 “ the ναος itself, (and the περιβολος, which sur-
 “ rounded it,) being accessible only to the
 “ priests, was built entirely by them. When

† See p. 40, 41. As Herod's operations were not merely *ornamental*, even if he had only repaired the Temple, and much less if he entirely rebuilt it, *exornasse* or *ornamented* seems inadequate to the original term *επιτεκεκοσμηθῆναι*. In *κοσμεῖν* the ideas of *beauty* and *ornament* are secondary to the ideas of *order* and *structure*. Homer (so valuable on every other account, as well as in all inquiries into the Greek language) uses *κοσμεῖν* in the primary sense only. Hesychius : Κοσμεῖν τινεῖς δίδαι. Κοσμηθεῖν, στήσαι. Κοσμος, κατασκευη. As *ornament* alone is every way inadequate to the meaning of Josephus, in the translation of *επιτεκεκοσμηθῆναι* I have included both ideas of *structure* and *ornament*.

“ the

“ the ~~work~~ was finished the people with great
 “ joy gave thanks to God, first, for the ex-
 “ pediton with which it had been finished ;
 “ and then for the zeal which the king had
 “ shewn in promoting its completion ; and
 “ celebrated the rebuilding with every ex-
 “ pression of festivity and satisfaction.”

If I may trust my own persuasions on this subject, no account can more evidently declare that Herod entirely took down the Temple and rebuilt it ; nor can ~~terms~~ be more definitive of such a fact, than the words in which the original account is delivered ; consequently that Josephus has not been *misinter-
 preted*. If the reader feels the same impression on his mind that I do, he will probably think that I have taken a great deal of unnecessary pains to bring him to a conclusion, which the narrative alone might have produced. I should have thought so too, perhaps ; if the Author of the Evidence had not advanced his opinions with a positive decision, which resisted all inquiry ; and such a want of proof to his *Evidence*, as precluded fair comparison. To counteract the tendency of the Evidence in both these respects, by supplying the reader with more ample materials for determining the point in question, I have laid before him, what has occurred to me of most consequence in favour of the opinion which the Evidence condemns.

condemns. And as some men of the most various and accurate erudition since the revival of ancient learning, are supposed (in the Evidence †) to have followed the common opinion only because they did not examine the Historian's account, I was willing to see how far they deserved a censure so derogatory to the acknowledged qualifications of the high character which they possess, and flattered myself with the consideration, that by *not taking the Evidence upon trust*, I should secure myself from the censure, which men of such superior learning had incurred.

The preceding remarks, which are the result of this research, I have reviewed with some attention, and have no reason to alter my opinions. Yet I cannot observe them all bearing in direct opposition to the decided and positive assertions of the "Evidence" without some apprehension of error. On one side or the other there is certainly some great fallacy. But I hope for the sake of historical

† "The learned" (*i. e.* Ribera, Scaliger, Casaubon, Grotius, Usher, Ernesti, Dr. Heberden &c.) "having *taken things upon trust*, without examination, have followed one another in a direct line; just as certain birds do when they are engaged in a long flight, when the first breaks the air, and the rest follow, without the trouble of opening a pathway for themselves; whereas if any of those great and learned persons, who have so quietly acquiesced in the notion of Herod's new Temple, would but have been at the pains of examining the Historian's account, they must inevitably have seen that he was either false or *misinterpreted*." Evidence, p. 51.

evidence

evidence in general, which is the ultimate end of this inquiry, and of Josephus's testimony in particular, which is the immediate object, the reader has not discovered it in these Remarks, or, at least, on that side of the question, which they maintain. If the Author of the Evidence is not satisfied with the view that is there given of the subject, I hope he will point out its defects on grounds of *substantial* Evidence, and principles of *just* Philology.

I shall endeavour to shew elsewhere, that it is not probable that the fact as it is recorded by Josephus should be a mere fiction of the Historian ; and that it is not incompatible with the usual application of the Prophecy of Haggai.

H POSTSCRIPT.

P O S T S C R I P T.

THE dates of the foundation and building of the temple by Zerubbabel, p. 25. are taken from the marginal Chronology to Ezra iii. iv. and Haggai. But the reader will not be displeased to compare the dates as they are settled by Mr. *Howes*, in his *Critical Observations*, Vol. II. p. 70, 81, 103, 104. And as the *finishing of the building of the Temple* is sometimes confounded with the *building of the walls of the city*, I have added other dates from the same learned and accurate *Inquiries into the Chronology of these Times*.

Before Christ.	Æra of Nabon.	
537	211	Cyrus takes Babylon. Jeshua and Zerubbabel conduct the Jews home. Edict made to build the Temple.
529	219	1st. Of Cambyfes. He reigned 8 years.
521	227	1st. Of Darius 1st, son of Hytaspis. He reigned 36.
520	228	2d. The Jews obtain leave to rebuild the Temple under Jeshua and Zerubbabel, agreeably to the edict of Cyrus.
516	232	6th. The Temple finished about February after the end of this year, and at the beginning of the 7th.
458	290	7th, of Artaxerxes 1st. Ezra carries presents to Jerusalem from Artaxerxes, and all the Persian nobles for a sacrifice, in thanks for the happy end of the rebellion in Egypt, and to beautify the Temple.
445	303	10th. Nehemiah is sent to Jerusalem to rebuild the city walls, which is now first opposed by Sanballat.



EXCERPTUM

E

FLAVII JOSEPHI

ANTIQ. JUD. LIB. XV.



* A

Κ Ε Φ. ια'.

Ὡς Ἡρώδης τὸν ναὸν μετεσκεύασε, καὶ πρὸς ἕψος
 ἀρας μείζον καὶ ἀξιοπρεπέστερον ἐξέτελεσε· καὶ
 περὶ τῆς βασιλεws, ἣν Ἀντωνίαν ἐκαλεσεν.

ΤΟΤΕ γοὺν ^α οκτωκαίδεκατου τῆς Ἡρώδου
 βασιλείας ^β γαγοντος ἐνιαυτου, μετὰ τὰς
 προεφημενας πρᾶξεις, ἔργον οὐ τὸ τυχὸν ἐπεβάλετο,
 τὸν νέον τοῦ Θεοῦ δι' αὐτοῦ ἑκατασκευασασθαι, μείζω
 τε τοῦ παριόλου, καὶ πρὸς ἕψος ἀξιοπρεπέστατον
 ἐγείρειν, ἡγούμενος ἅπαντων αὐτῶ τῶν πεπραγμένων
 ἐπίσημοτερον, ὥσπερ ἦν, ἐκτελεσθῆσεσθαι τοῦτο, καὶ
 πρὸς αἰώνιον μνημὴν ἀρχεσεῖν. οὐκ ἔτοιμον δὲ τὸ πλη-
 θος ἐπιστάμενος, οὐδὲ ῥαδίον εἶσεσθαι πρὸς τὸ μέγεθος
 τῆς ἐπιχειρήσεως, ἡξίου λόγῳ προκαταστησαμένης
 ἐγχειρησθαι τῷ παντί, καὶ συγκαλεσας αὐτοὺς ἐλεγε

^α Οκτωκαίδεκατου] Sc. postquam Herodes regnum adierat, captis Hierosolymis, ut dicit *Casaub.* quem videtis in *Exercit.* xiiii. contra *Baronium*, n. 32. et *Lud. Capellum* in *Spicilegio* ad *Joan.* c. 3. v. 20. *Hvds.* Male 15 in ed. Gr. vid. *Petav. Doct.* Temp. P. II. p. 221.—*Αλυσ.* lib. 1. c. 21. §. 1. anno πεντηκαίδεκατῳ Herodis instauratum templum dicitur. *Zonaras* autem p. 243 C. οκτωκαίδεκατῳ id factum dicit. *SPANHEIM.*

^β Γαγοντος ἐνιαυτου] Non de ineunte sed adulto jam Herodis anno xviii capiendum esse *Josephum* ostendit *Basnagius*, tom. i. p. 66.

^γ Κατασκευασασθαι] *Hardwinus* (in nummis Herodiadum p. 336.) *Josephi* historiam de instaurato ab Herode Templo in augustiorem

C A P. XI.

Quomodo Herodes templum in aliam formam mutavit, atque altius et magnificentius exstruxit: deque turri, quam Antoniam vocavit.

TUNC igitur decimo octavo regni Herodis anno, post ea facta quæ superius dicta sunt, arduum opus aggressus est, *scilicet* ut Dei templum sua opera ædificatum iret, eique ampliorem ambitum daret et in altitudinem magnificentissimam erigeret; cogitans fore id omnibus quæ unquam fecisset præclarius, sicuti erat, si illud perficere ei contingerit, atque futurum ad sempiternam *sui* memoriam. Verum cum populum *ad hoc* minus paratum esse intelligeret, neque facilem habiturum esse ad rem tantæ magnitudinis aggrediendam, in animum induxit prius eos oratione præparare, ac deinde toti operi manum admovere: cumque illos convocasset, verba fecit in hunc

augustiore formam mendacii insinuat: sed frustra; quod ostenderunt viri summi *Casaubonus* c. *Baron.* n. 22. *Simsonus* ad A. M. 3987. et *Toniellus* ad A. M. 4032. vide infra ad §. 3. H U D S. Instauratio tamen Templi potius, quam Novum Templum ob *ἰνδολογισμοῖ* seu continuata sacrificia. vid. *Scalig.* de Emend. Temp. lib. VI. p. 635. Eadem Templi hujus structura finita demum LXXXIII. annis, tribus ab Herode cæpto, anno XVIII. regni, et circa belli Judaici initium. Fictam autem ac fabulis refertam Josephi narrationem de renovatione ædis ab Herode &c. jamdudum *Salianus* docuit ad A. M. 4035. *Harduin.* de Numm. Herod. Ep. 27. ΣΠΑΗ.

* A 2

Ὁμοφυλοῦς]

τοιαυτά. "Τὰ μὲν ἄλλα μοι τῶν ὑπὲρ τὴν βασιλείαν
 "πραγμάτων, ἄνδρες ὁμοφυλοὶ, περισσὸν ὑπολαμ-
 "βάνω λέγειν, καὶ τοιούτον ἐγγεῖναι τὸν τρόπον, ὥς
 "ἐλάττω μὲν ἐμοὶ τὸν ἀπ' αὐτῶν κόσμον, πλεονάζει δὲ
 "ὑμῖν τὴν ἀσφαλείαν φέρειν. Οὐτε γὰρ ἐν τοῖς δυσ-
 "χερέστατοις ἀμελήσας τῶν εἰς τὰς ὑμετέρας χρεῖας
 "διαφερόντων, οὐτε ἐν τοῖς χαλᾶσκειν ἀσφαλείᾳ ἐπιτηδεύ-
 "σας ἐμαυτῷ μᾶλλον ἢ καὶ πᾶσιν ὑμῖν τὸ ἀνεπηρέασ-
 "τον, αἰμαὶ σὺν τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ βουλῇ πρὸς εὐδαι-
 "μονίαν ὅσον οὐ πρότερον ἀποχάνει τοῦ Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος.
 "Τὰ μὲν οὖν χαλὰ μέρος ἐξείργασθαι περὶ τὴν χάραν
 "καὶ πόλεις, ὅσας ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ τοῖς ἐπιτετιτοῖς ἐγγε-
 "ραῖνες κόσμῳ τῷ χαλλισίῳ, τὸ γένος ὑμῶν κίξασ-
 "ται, περιεργαζομαι μοι δοκεῖ λέγειν εὐδοσί. Τὸ δὲ τῆς ἐπι-
 "χειρήσεως, ὅς τις νῦν ἐπιχειρεῖν βουλομένη, παῖλος εὐσε-
 "βεῖστον καὶ καλλιστόν ἐφ' ἡμῶν γινώσκει νῦν εὐφραν-
 "ται. Τὸν γὰρ νότον τούτων ἐκδοδμήσαντα μὲν τῷ παλαιῷ
 "Θεῷ πατέρες ἡμεῖς, μέγα τὴν ἐκ Βαβυλωνος ἄνασ-
 "τασιν. Εὐδοσί δ' αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸ μέγιστον εἰς ὑμῶν ἐξ-
 "ουσία πτήχης· τοσούτον γὰρ ὑπερέκειν ὁ πρῶτος ἐκεῖνος,
 "ὃν Σολομὼν ἀνέκδοδμήσει. Καὶ μηδεὶς ἀμελείαν ἐν-
 "σθενείας τῶν πατέρων χαλᾶ γινώσκει. γέγονε γὰρ οὐ παρ'
 "ἐκείνους ἐλάττω ὁ νότος· ἀλλὰ ταῦτα καὶ Κύριος καὶ
 "Δαρεῖος ὁ Υἱὸς Αἰσίου τα μέγιστα τῆς δοδμήσεως εὐδοσί,

ὁμοφυλοὶ] Judaeos vocat ὁμοφυλους, quanquam fuit Idu-
 mæus, ad captandam benevolentiam. SPANH.

ὅς τις νῦν ἐπιχειρεῖν βουλομαι] ὅς τις νῦν ἐπιχειρεῖν ἐπιβάλλομαι HEN-
 ET LUGD. BAT.

ἄνασται]

modum. " De aliis quidem ex quo regnare cœpi
 " a me factis, viri populares, nihil necesse mihi
 " dicere arbitror, quanquam ita comparata fue-
 " rint, ut vobis plus securitatis quam mihimet
 " ornamentum attulerint. Nam cum in rebus dif-
 " ficillimis neque ea neglexerim quæ ad vestras
 " necessitates levandas facerent, neque in iis quæ
 " ædificavi studuerim ut ipse magis quam vos
 " omnes ab injuriis facti tecti essetis, mihimet
 " persuadeo quod Dei voluntate Judæorum gen-
 " tem ad eam, quam nunquam antea habuerunt,
 " felicitatem perduxerim. Cæterum, *ut dixi*, si-
 " gillatim omnia, quæ per provinciam perfecimus,
 " quotque urbes in ea et regione ei contributa ex-
 " citando genus vestrum maximis ornamentis
 " auximus, vobis commemorare, qui ea probe
 " nostis, supervacaneum mihi videtur. Quod
 " autem in præsentia mihi in animo est aggredi,
 " id omnium pientissimum, vobisque pulcherri-
 " mum fore nunc *paucis* ostendam. Fuit quidem
 " templum hoc summo Deo a parentibus nostris
 " ædificatum, cum a Babylone revertissent. Ve-
 " rum ei ad altitudinem defunt cubiti sexaginta :
 " tanto enim altius erat primum illud a Solomone
 " constructum. Nemo tamen negligentiam pie-
 " tatis nostrorum parentum accuset. Nam per
 " illos non stetit, quo minus hoc magnitudine
 " prius adæquaret : sed Cyrus et Darius Hytaspis
 " filius hunc ædificii modum præscripserunt ; qui-

' *Αναστον*] *Επαροδο* Hen. et Lugd. Bat. quod pro interpre-
 tamento habeo.

* *Primum*

“ οἷς ἐκεῖνοι καὶ τοῖς ἀπογόνοις δουλεύσαντες, καὶ μεῖ-
 “ ἐκείνους Μακεδόσιν, οὐκ ἔσχον εὐχαιρίαν τὸ πρῶτον
 “ τῆς εὐσεβείας ἀρχετυπὸν εἰς ταῦτον ἀναγαγεῖν με-
 “ γέθος. Ἐπεὶ δὲ νῦν ἐγὼ μὲν ἀρχὴ Θεοῦ βουλήσῃ,
 “ πᾶρεσπὶ γὰρ καὶ μῆκος εἰρήνης, καὶ κτήσις χρημάτων,
 “ καὶ μέγας πρὸς δαῖν, τὸ δὲ μέγιστον, φίλοι καὶ δι’
 “ εὐνοίας οἱ πάντων (ὡς ἔπος εἶπεν) κράτου Ῥωμαίων,
 “ πείρασόμαί, τὸ παρημελημένον ἀνάγκη καὶ δουλεία
 “ τοῦ πρῶτον χρόνου διορθούμενος, τελειὰν ἀποδου-
 “ ναί τῷ Θεῷ τῇ ἀνθ’ ὧν ἐτυχὼν τῆς βασι-
 “ λείας εὐσεβείαν.

β’. Ὁ μὲν Ἡρώδης ταύτῃ εἶπεν, ἐξεπλήθη δὲ τοὺς
 πολλοὺς ὁ λόγος πᾶρα δόξαν ἐμπεσὼν· καὶ τὸ μὲν
 τῆς ἐλπίδος ἀπίστον οὐκ ἐπηΐφειρεν αἰῶν. ἠδῆμονουν δὲ,
 μὴ φθασας, καταλυσθαι τὸ πᾶν ἔργον οὐκ ἐξαρκεσεῖ
 πρὸς τέλος ἀγαγεῖν τὴν προαίρεσιν· ὅ, τι κινδύνος αὐ-
 τοῖς μείζων ἐφαίνετο, καὶ δυσὲς χειρὶ τὸν ἐδοκεῖ τὸ με-
 γέθος τῆς ἐπιβολῆς. Οὕτω δ’ αὐτὸν διακείμενον,
 παρεθάρρυνεν ὁ βασιλεὺς, οὐ πρῶτον κατὰ τὴν φαι-
 μένος τὸν νεῶν ἢ πάντων αὐτῶ των εἰς τὴν συντελείαν
 παρσκευασμένων. Καὶ ταῦτα προεῖπων οὐκ ἐφεισάτο.
 Χιλίας γὰρ ἐντρεπίσας ἁμαξάς, αἱ βαστάσουσι τοὺς
 λίθους, ἑβδάτας δὲ μυρίους τοὺς ἐμπειροτάτους ἐπιλεξα-
 μένος, καὶ ἱερεύσιν τὸν ἀριθμὸν χιλίοις ἱερατικὰς

* ἱερατικά;] Videfis Seldenum, lib. 3, de Synedriis, c. xi.
 p. 172, 173.

• *Primum*

"bus illi subiecti, eorumque filiis, et post illos
 "Macedonibus, facultatem non habuerunt * pri-
 "mum *boc pietatis illorum* exemplar ad eandem
 "magnitudinem perducendi. Quoniam vero nunc
 "ego quidem Dei beneficio regnum adeptus sum,
 "et longa pace fruor, et divitiis affluo, et magnis
 "reditibus abundo: quodque maximum est, cum
 "Romanis, omnium (ut ita loquar) dominis, in
 "amicitia sum et gratia, operam dabo, ut, id
 "quod necessitate et superiorum temporum servi-
 "tute omissum est refarciendo, perfectam Deo,
 "pro illius in me beneficiis, hujusce regni pieta-
 "tem reddam."

2. Et quidem Herodes hæc verba habuit: mul-
 ti vero sermone ejus attoniti sunt, quod præter
 opinionem accidebat: et, quia incredibile mini-
 meque sperandum dicere putabatur, nihil animis
 attollebantur. Sed anxii erant et solliciti, ne si to-
 tum opus jam dissolveret, non satis opum haberet
 ad perficiendum quod proposuerit: atque in majus
 illis crescebat periculum, et augeri visa est rei
 difficultas ex incepti magnitudine. Cum autem
 ita affecti essent, rex eos confirmabat, dicens, non
 se prius templum diruturum, quam omnia, quæ
 ad id absolvendum pertinerent, præparasset. At-
 que hæc præfatus, fidem firmavit. Nam cum
 mille carros ad vehendos lapidis comparasset, et

* *Primum boc pietatis illorum*] Vel, ad eandem cum primo
 pietatis exemplari magnitudinem &c. ut *κατα* ante *πρωτον* sub-
 intelligatur.

ἡ ἀνάστασις

ωνισαμενος στολας, και τους μεν ^h διδαξας οικοδομους, ετερους δε τεκτονας, ηπλετο της κατασκευης, απαντων αυτω προθυμως προευντρεπισμενων.

γ'. ⁱ Ανελων δε τους αρχαιους θεμελιους, και καταβαλομενος ετερους, επ' αυτων τον ναον ηγειρε, μικρον μεν εχαιτον οντα πηχων, το δ' υψος εικοσι περιτλοις, ^k ους τω χρονω συνησαντων πων θεμελιων υπεβη και τουτο μεν ^l κατα τους Νερωνος καιρους επεγαγεν εγνωκειμεν. Ωκοδομηθη δε ο ναος εκ λιθων μεν λευκων τε και κρατερων, το μεγαθος εκαστων περι πιντε και εικοσι πηχεις επι μικρος, οκτω δε υψος, ευρος δε περι δωδεκα. και παντος αυτου χαροτι και της βασιλικης στοας το μεν ενθεν και ενθεν ταπεινωτατον, υψηλοτατον δε το μεσαιτατον, ως περιοπιον εκ πολλων σταδίων ειναι τοις την χωραν νεμομενοις, μαλλον δ' ει

^h Διδαξας οικοδομους] Vocem διδαξας in suo codice habuisse videtur Epirhan. qui vertit, sed et quosdam cementarios, alios autem fabros lignarios eruditos ad templi fabricam hortabatur. Επιταξας οικοδομους legendum esse conjicit Montacutius in Origineibus Eccl. p. 49. et κατασκευας οικ. in Antidiatriba p. 247. Verum licet utrumque ferri possit (aut διαταξας ex conjectura Coselerii in Mon. Eccl. Gr. vol. 2. p. 245.) vox οικοδομους repugnat Josepho, qui postea dicit του δε ναου δια των ιερων οικοδομηθεις.

ⁱ Ανελων δε τους αρχαιους θεμελιους] Templum (ut ait Grotius lib. 5. de Ver. Christ. Rel.) non ex ruinis refuscitatum fuit, sed paulatim per partes innovatum: qualis mutatio facit idem templum appellari. Huds. Ex his verbis nonnulli collegerunt hoc quod struxisse dicitur Herodes ædificium, habendum esse pro templo novo et quidem tertio, quod distinctum erat a templo secundo, quod ædificarunt Hebræi reduces facti ex Babylonia. Verum Judæi ipsi (quorum tamen maxime intererat hoc templum, si fieri posset, tertium appellare, ut ita Messias noster dici non posset venisse stante illo templo, quod a Zorobabele et sociis ejus conditum fuit) templum hoc, uti ab Herode erat exædificatum,

decem peritissimorum opificum millia delegisset, et mercatus mille sacerdotibus vestes sacerdotales, eos partim lapides partim ligna fabricare docuisset, opus aggressus est, omnibus diligenter præparatis.

3. Sublatis autem veteribus fundamentis, et jactis aliis, templum super eis erexit in longitudinem cubitorum centum, in altitudinem *totidem* et viginti amplius, qui viginti aliquanto post confidentibus fundamentis retro cesserunt. Atque hoc, *quicquid erat*, attollere decreveramus Neronis temporibus. Ædificatum autem est templum ex lapidibus candidis et firmis; et singulorum magnitudo erat in longum ad cubitos circiter quinque et viginti, in altitudinem octo, in latitudinem vero circiter duodecim. Eratque totum templum (quemadmodum et regia porticus) utraque parte depressius, medio vero editius, adeo ut a multis stadiis regionis incolis conspicuum esset, maxime

exædificatum, et dein a Tito versum fuit, nunquam alio nomine in Talmude et aliis scriptis nuncupant, quod sciam, quam בית שני Templum secundum. Christiani autem nequeunt ullo modo dubitare, quin templum uti Herodes illud renovavit idem fuerit, adeoque templum secundum appellandum, ac illud quod Zorobabel excitavit, quoniam stante eodem illo templo secundo, quod Zerobabelis opera constitutum est, Messias venire debuit, uti Haggai cap. 2. prædictum est. Si autem Templum tertium et plane novum haberi debeat, ac diversum a secundo, quomodo Christus venit stante Templo secundo? Denique num cultus sacer unquam legitur in templis fuisse tempore Herodis? quod factum oportuit, si Sanctum et Sanctum Sanctorum plane nova facta sunt, sublatis veteribus. REL.

^k Οὗς τῇ χρόνῃ συνησαντων τῶν διελθῶν ὑπὲρ] Versio nostra et sensus postulat ut sit ellipsis vocis κατὰ ante οὗς. Integre enim καὶ οὗς — ὑπὲρ. Hanc rem pro impossibili habet *Villalpandus* ad *Ezech.* tom. 2. p. 577.

^l Κατὰ τοῦ Νεῖκτος Vide Lib. 20. c. 8. et *Torniellum* ad A. M. 4082. et *Usserium* ad A. M. 3987.

* B

^m Κατ'

πῶς ^μ κατ' ἐναντίον οἰκούντες ἢ προσιόντες τυχαίαν.
^α Θύρας δὲ ἐπὶ ταῖς εἰσοδοῖς συν τοῖς ὑπερθύροις, ἴσον
 ἔχουσας τῷ ναῷ, ποικίλοις ἐμπέτασμασι κεκοσμητοί,
 τὰ μὲν ἀνθ' αἰλουργεῖσι, κίονας δ' ἐνυφασμένοις. κα-
 θυπερθεὶν δ' αὐτῶν ^ο ὑπὸ τοῖς θριγγχάμασιν, ἀμπέλους
 διετετατοῦ χρυσοῦ, τοὺς βοτρυς ἀπηφωρμένους ἔχουσαι.
 θαῦμα καὶ τοῦ μεγέθους καὶ τῆς τέχνης τοῖς ἰδοῦσιν,
 οἷον ἐν πολυτελείᾳ τῆς ὕλης τὸ κατασκευασθῆναι.
 περιελαμβάνει δὲ καὶ τοαῖς μεγίσταις ^ρ τὸν ναὸν ἀπαν-
 τα, πρὸς τὴν ἀναλογίαν ἐπιτηδεύων, καὶ τὰς δα-
 πανὰς τῶν πρὶν ὑπερβάλλομενος, ὥς οὐκ ἄλλος τις
 ἔδοκει ἐπικεκοσμηκεῖναι τὸν ναόν. ^ι ἀμφὸς δ' ἦσαν με-
 γάλου τειχοῦς, αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ τεῖχος ἔργον μεγίστον ἀν-
 θρώποις ἀκουσθῆναι. λόφος ἦν πετρῶδης, ἀναντῆς,
 πρὸς τοὺς ἑσώτους μέρει τῆς πόλεως ὑππύουμενος
 ἐπὶ τὴν κορυφὴν ἀκρὰν. τοῦτον ^τ ὁ πρῶτος ἡμῶν βα-
 σιλευσας Σολομών, κατ' ἐπιφροσύνην τοῦ Θεοῦ, με-
 γάλαις ἐργασίαις ἀπετειχίζειν ἀνάθεν τὰ περὶ τὴν
 ἀκρὰν, ἀπετειχίζει δὲ κατῶθεν ὑπὸ τῆς ῥίζης ἀρχο-
 μένος, ἣν βαθεῖα περικύβηται φαραγξ, κατὰ λίθας τὰς
 πέτραις μολιβδῶ δεδεμέναις πρὸς ἀλλήλας ἀπολαμ-

^μ Κατ' ἐναντίον οἰκούντες] Κατ' ἐναντίον dicit, ut orientalem plagam designet. *L'Empereur de Mesuris Templi.*

^α Θύρας δ] Cum hæc dicit (inquit *L'Empereur*) non exteriorem, sed interiorem portam, quæ ad fanum ducebat, intelligi vult.

^ο Ὑπὸ τοῖς θριγγχάμασιν] Ita lego cum *Selden*, (Lib. 2. de *Jure Naturæ et Gentium*, c. 8. p. 234.) probante *Petito* in *Animadv.* Tom. 4. p. 134. Ὑπὸ τοῖς τεῖχος in *Græcis* omnibus. In versione *Ephraïmi* omittuntur. — Ὑπὸ τοῖς θριγγχάμασιν, *Sub mœri coronulis*, hoc est, in fronte supra fores, ut explicat *Seldenus*.

^ρ Τῶν

si qui ex adverso habitarent aut eo accederent. Fores in ingressu cum superliminaribus, ipsi fano æquales, aulæis multicoloribus ornatas habebat, quibus erant et flores purpurei et columnæ intextæ. At supra hæc sub muri coronulis vitis expansa erat aurea, cum racemis ex illa sublimē pendentibus; ea quasi materiæ profusione facta, ut aspicientibus tam magnitudine quam arte stuporem incuteret. Quin et templo universo circumdedit porticus ingentes, proportionis rationem habens, et sumptibus majores superans, ut nec quisquam alius videretur ita templum exornasse. Ambæ autem magno innitebantur muro: ipse vero murus opus omnium quæ homines auditu acceperunt maximum. Collis erat petrosus, arduus, ad orientale urbis latus sensim ac leniter resupinatus usque ad summum ejus fastigium. Hunc *collem* Solomon, qui primus in nos regnavit, superne ad verticem muro circumduxit, Dei *ipsius* instinctu: immo et inferne, a radicibus *ejus* incipiens, quibus ad libem circumjecta est vallis admodum depressa, *eundem* vallavit faxis grandibus plumbo inter se vinctis, semper aliquid spatii intus concludens, et

P Τον ναον ἀπαντα] Est qui sic distinguit, τον ναον, ἀπαντα πρὸς τὴν ἀναλογίαν.

9 Ἀμφὶ δ' ἦσαν] Videtur esse Ellipsis præpositionis ἐπὶ, ut sit ἀμφὶ δ' ἦσαν ἐπὶ μεγάλῳ τειχεῖ.

10 Ὁ πρῶτος ἡμῶν βασιλευσας Σολομων] Primus scilicet e stirpe Davidica. Alibi etiam Solomonem primum ponit in serie Regum. Dicit (l. 20. c. 8.) opus fuisse Solomonis, του πρώτου διημαμένου το σύμπαν ἱερὸν, et (lib. 6. de *Bello Jud.* c. 6.) του Σολομῶντος βασιλεύος, ὃς καὶ τον ναον ἐκτίσκει.

βαιων απο της εσω χωρας, και προβαιναν εις βα-
θους, ὡς^α απορον ειναι το, τε μεγαθος της οικοδομης και
το ὕψος τετραγωνου γενομενης, ὡς τα μεν μεγαθη των
λιθων απο μετωπου χαΐα την επιφανειαν ὀρασθαι, τα
δ' εντος σιδηρῳ διησφαλισμενα συνεχεν τας ἄρμους
ακινήτους τῷ παντι χρονῷ. της δ' εργασιας οὕτω
συναπτουσης εις ακρον τον λοφον, απεργασαμενος
αυτου την κορυφην, και τα κοιλα των περι το τειχος
εμπλησας, ἰσοπέδον τοις χατα την επιφανειαν την
ανω και λειον ἐποίησε. τουτο δε ην το παν περιβο-
λος, πεττάρων σταδίων τον κυκλον εχων, ἕκαστης
γωνιας σταδίου μηκος απολαμβάνουσης. ἐνδοτέρῳ δε
τουτου και παρ' αυτην την ακραν αλλο τειχος ανω
λίθινον περικει, χατα μεν ἑῶαν ῥαχιν, ἰσομικη τῷ
τειχει στοαν εχων διπλην, εν μέσω του νεῷ τετυχη-
κοτος, αφορώσαν εις τας θύρας αυτου. ταυτην πολ-
λοι βασιλεις οἱ προσθεν χατεσκευασαν. του δ' ἱεροῦ
παντος ην εν κυκλῷ πεπηγμενα σκυλα βαρβαρικά,
και ταυτα παντα βασιλεὺς Ηρώδης ανεθηκε, προσ-
θεις ὅσα και των Αραβων ελαβεν.

δ'. Κατα δε την βορειον πλευραν, ακροπαλις εγ-
γωνιος ευερχης ἐπετειχιστο, διαφορος σχυροτητι. ταυ-
την οἱ προ Ηρώδου του Ασσυμοναιων γενους βασιλεις
και αρχιερεῖς ὠκοδομησαν, και βαρὺν ἐχαλεσαν ὡς
ἐκει την ἱεράτικην αυτοις ἀποκεισθαι στολην, ἣν ὅταν

^α Ἐκαστης γωνιας] *Ubi quoque latere inter angulos.*

^β βαρὺν] Cf. *Antiq. Lib. x. c. xi. §. 7.* ΣΡΑΝΗ.

alte progrediens, adeo ut immanis esset magnitudo pariter ac profunditas structuræ, forma quadrangulari factæ, ut vastitas quidem lapidum a fronte quoad superficiem in conspectum veniret, interiora vero ferro firmata compagines in omne ævum indivulsas haberent. Opere ita continuato ut summitati collis jungeretur, cum verticem illius aliquantulum lævigasset et cavitates intra murum comprehensas replevisset, superficiei partibus quæ forte eminent totum æquavit et ad planum redegit. Atque universum hoc septum erat, quatuor stadiorum in circuitu, unoquoque angulo in longitudinem stadium complectente. Interius deinde ipsum verticem ambit alius murus lapideus, ad orientale quidem latus duplicem sustinens porticum pari cum muro longitudine, spectantem ad januas templi, quod ad medium ejus constitit. Hanc multi priorum regum adornaverant. Porro circa templum undique fixa erant spolia peregrinarum gentium, atque ea omnia rex Herodes dedicavit, additis etiam quæ ab Arabibus ipse reportarat.

4. Ad septentrionale autem *septi* latus arx constructa erat quadrata, bene munita atque egregie firma. Hanc qui Herodem antecesserunt, Asamonæo prognati, reges et sacerdotes, ædificarunt, et Barim appellarunt, ut ibi stola sacerdotalis illis

▪ 'Hv δταν δη Συνη] Videbis *Seringbanum* in Cod. *Joma*, p. 152.

δεῖν θύειν, τότε μόνον ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἀμφιεννυτά. ταύτην ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρώδης ἐφυλάξεν ἐν τῷ τοπῷ, καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐκείνου τελευτὴν ὑπο Ρωμαίοις ἦν, μέχρι τῶν Τιβερίου Καίσαρος χρόνων. ἐπὶ τούτου δὲ Οὐίτελλιος ὁ τῆς Συρίας ἡγούμενος, ἐπιδήμεσας τοῖς Ἱεροσολυμοῖς, δεξάμενου τοῦ πληθους αὐτὸν λαμπροῖα λα πανυ, θελὼν αὐτοὺς τῆς ευποΐας ἀμειψασθαι, ἐπεὶ παρεχάλεσαν τὴν ἱερὰν στολὴν ὑπο τὴν αὐτὰν ἐξουσίαν εἶχειν, ἐγράφε περὶ τούτων Τιβερίῳ Καίσαρι, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπέτρεψε καὶ παρεμείνεν ἡ ἐξουσία τῆς ἱερατικῆς στολῆς τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, μέχρι ἐτελευτήσῃ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀγριππας. μετὰ τούτου δὲ Κασσιος Λογίνος, ὁ τὴν Συρίαν τότε διοικῶν, καὶ Κουσπίος Φαδδς, ὁ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐπιτροπος, κελεuousi τοὺς Ἰουδαίους εἰς τὴν Ἀντωνίαν καταθῆσθαι τὴν στολὴν· Ρωμαίους γὰρ αὐτῆς εἶναι δεῖν κυρίους, καὶ ὡς καὶ πρότερον ἦσαν. πέμπουσιν οὖν Ἰουδαῖοι πρεσβεις πρὸς Κλαυδίον Καίσαρα περὶ τούτων παραχάλεσοντας. ὧν ἀναβάντων, ὁ νεώτερος βασιλεὺς Ἀγριππας, ἐν Ρώμῃ τυγχάνων, αἰτησάμενος πᾶρα τοῦ αυτοκράτορος τὴν ἐξουσίαν εἶλαι, ἐντείλαμενου Οὐίτελλῳ τῷ τῆς Συρίας ὀντι στρατηγῷ.

ὑπο Ρωμαίοις ἦν] Archelai tempore penes Judæos fuisse dicit, l. xviii.

Οὐίτελλιος — ἐπέτρεψε.] De hoc Vitellii facto infra lib. viii. c. 5. §. 3. et lib. xx. c. 1. §. 2. stolam Pontificalem in Antonia Arce fervatam Sacerdotibus in Templo custodiendam permittit. Jussi postea Judæi stolam denuo in Antonia reponere. Stola Pontificalis arce prope Templum asservari solita, Judæis sub Imp. concessa. Eadem sub Claudio primo in Arce Antonia, portæ junioris Agrippæ custodiæ. SPANH.

Ἀγριππας]

reponeretur, quam ipse pontifex, duntaxat cum erat facienda res divina, induere solebat. Hanc stolam rex Herodes eo in loco custodivit, et post ejus obitum fuit in potestate Romanorum, usque ad tempora Tiberii Cæsaris. Sub eo Vitellius Syriæ prætor, cum Hierosolyma venisset, et a populo honorificentissime exceptus fuisset, volens eis gratiam referre, ipse, quoniam obsecrarunt ut *sacra* stola illis in potestatem permetteretur, hac de re scripsit ad Tiberium Cæsarem, atque ille eam concessit *eis*: mansitque penes Judæos stolæ sacerdotalis potestas usque ad decessum regis Agrippæ. Post eum Cassius Longinus, qui tum Syriam administrabat, et Cuspius Fadus, Judææ procurator, Judæis imperarunt, ut stolam ponerent in Antonia: debere enim Romanos eam penes se habere, sicut antea. Quamobrem Judæi legatos ad Claudium Cæsarem miserunt, eam rem deprecuros. Qui cum Romam pervenissent, juvenis rex Agrippa, qui tum illic erat, perfecit suo rogatu apud imperatorem ut eam illis potestatem traderet, hoc ipso Vitellio in mandatis dato, Syriæ *tunc* prætori. Antea erat sub sigillo pontificis et

* *Αγρίππας*] Act. xii. v. 1. dicitur Herodes, quam *Syrus* recte appellat Agrippam, magni Herodis filium, ex qua familia quotquot erant, communi nomine Herodes vocabantur.

† *Αντωνία*] Confer de Antonia Arce prope Templum, lib. xviii. c. 5. §. 3.

‡ *Ὁ νεώτερος βασιλεὺς Ἀγρίππας*] Filius ejus Herodis Agrippæ, de quo supra hac ead. Sect. et Act. 12. vide *Grotium* ad Act. 25. 13.

• *Προτορὸν*]

^a πρῶτον δ' ἦν ὑπὸ σφραγίδος τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ τῶν
 γαζοφυλακῶν, καὶ πρὸ μιᾶς ἡμέρας ^b τῆς ἑορτῆς, ἐπέ-
 την Ρωμαίων φρουράρχον ἀναβαίνοντες οἱ γαζοφυλα-
 κες, καὶ καταμανθάνοντες τὴν ἑαυτῶν σφραγίδα, τὴν
 στολὴν ἐλαμβάνον. εἰτ' αὖτις τῆς ἑορτῆς παρελθού-
 σης, εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν κομισαντὶς τοπικῶν, καὶ τῷ φρου-
 ράρχῃ δειξάντες ^c συμφυτοῦν τὴν σφραγίδα, κατεπι-
 γέντο. ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ^d ὑπὸ τοῦ παύους τῶν ἐπι-
 συμβέβηκωτων παρεδὴλωθη. τότε δ' οὖν ὁ τῶν Ιου-
 δαίων βασιλεὺς Ἡρώδης καὶ ταύτῃ τὴν βαρὶν οχυρώ-
 τεραν κατασκευάσας, ἐπ' ἀσφάλειαν καὶ φυλακὴν τοῦ
 ἱεροῦ, χαρίζομενος Ἀντωνίῳ, φίλῳ μὲν αὐτοῦ Ρωμαίων
 δὲ ἀρχόντι, πρῶτην ἡρώδου Ἀντωνίαν.

ε'. Ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐσπερίοις μέρεσι τοῦ περιβολοῦ, πυ-
 λαὶ τεσσαρες ἐφειστάσαν, ἡ μὲν εἰς τὰ βαπτεῖα τει-
 νούσα, τῆς ἐν μέσῳ φαραγὸς εἰς διόδον ἀπειλημένης,
 αἱ δὲ δύο εἰς τὸ πρῶτον, ἡ λοιπὴ δὲ εἰς τὴν ἀλ-
 λὴν πόλιν, βαθμύσι πολλαῖς κατὰ τὴν φα-
 ραγίδα διειλημμένη, καὶ ἀπὸ ταύτης ἀνω παλιν ἐπὶ
 τὴν πρῶτην. ἀντικρὺ γὰρ ἡ πόλις ἐκεῖτο τοῦ ἱεροῦ,
 θεατροειδὴς οὖσα, περιεχόμενῃ βαθεῖα φαραγίᾳ κατὰ
 πάν το νοτικὸν κλίμα. τὸ δὲ τετάρτον αὐτοῦ μετώπον,

^a Πρῶτον — γαζοφυλακῶν] Confer Lib. xviii. c. 5. §. 3. SPANH.

^b Τῆς ἑορτῆς] Notat P. Molinaeus in Vate suo, c. 25. stolam hanc tribus tantum festis solennibus, sc. Paschalis, Pentecostes, et Tabernaculorum, pontifici traditam fuisse.

^c Συμφωνοῦ] Ita reponi jussi ex L. B. quum magis convenire huc videatur, quam Vulg. hactenus συμφυτοῦν, quod dicit rem rei

sacri ærarii quæstorum : et pridie festorum ibant quæstores ad præfectum Romani præsidii, et agnito suo sigillo eam auferebant. Deinde rursus festis transactis in eundem locum referebant, et, sigillo quod concordabat cum ostenso præsidii præfecto, *illic eam* deponebant. Et hæc quidem ex iis qui postea acciderunt casibus declarata sunt. Verum hanc turrin Herodes rex Judæorum tunc munitiorem fecit, ad templi securitatem et custodiam ; et in gratiam Antonii, amici sui et Romanorum imperatoris, nominavit Antoniam.

5. A septi autem parte occidentali quatuor erant portæ, quarum una ferebat in regiam, valle interjacente ad transitum intercepta *et completa* ; duæ in suburbium ; postrema in aliam urbem, multis gradibus distincta, ut in vallem descendatur, et deinde ab ea rursus esset ascensus. Nam urbs posita erat e regione templi, speciem præbens theatri, cincta valle profunda circa latus meridianum. Quarta autem pars frontis *templi* a meridie habebat et ipse portas in medio, simulque regiam por-

rei adeo arte adhærentem, ut una cum illa nata atque orta videatur. Hic vero agitur de obsignationis cera et sigillo obsignante, quæ quidem duo semper debent esse *συμφυα*, seu *secum convenientia* ; at *συμφυα* esse nunquam possunt. *Epiphanius* vertit *simul cum sigillis*. At *Huds.* ita, et sigillo quod eam comitabatur ostenso ; pro quo reposuimus, quod concordabat, &c. *HAV.*

^d Τὸ τοῦ πατρὸς] Forſan ἐπὶ et mox προδιδωδῇ.

• C

• Κατὰ

το προς μεσημβριαν, ερχε μεν και αὐτο σὺλγος ἑχάλα
 μεσον, ἐπ' αὐτῆ δὲ τὴν βασιλικὴν τῶαν, τριπλὴν
 χεῖρα μῆκος διέκταν ἀπο τῆς ἑσπας φαραγῆος ἐπὶ τὴν
 ἑσπεριον. καὶ γὰρ ἦν ἐκτείνειν πρὸς σωτέρῳ δυνατόν. ἐργον
 δ' ἦν ἀξιαφηγητοτάτων τῶν ὑφ' ἡλίου. μεγάλη γὰρ
 ὄντος τοῦ τῆς φαραγῆος ἀναλημματος, καὶ οὐδ' ἀνεκ-
 τοῦ χεῖτιδεν καὶ τὶς ἀνάγειν εἰς τὸν βυθὸν εὐκυνπτοί,
 παμμεγέθης ὕψος ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ τῆς τῶας ἀνέστηκεν, ὥς
 καὶ τὶς ἀπ' ἀκροῦ τοῦ ταύτης τεγούς ἀμφὶ συντιθεῖς
 τα βαθρὰ διοπίθουσι, σκοτιδίμην, οὐκ ἐξικαιμένης τῆς
 οἴκως εἰς ἀμικτήτον τοῦ βυθὸν. ζῶντες δ' ἐφροτασάν
 κατ' ἀντιστιχὸν ἀλλήλοισ ἐπὶ μῆκος πετραχά· συνε-
 δέδετο γὰρ ὁ τέταρτος στοιχος λιθοδομήτων τεγχεῖ
 καὶ πᾶχος ἦν ἑκατοῦ κίονος, ὥς τρεῖς ἐπταναπλόνιον
 ἀλλήλοισ τὰς ὀργὰς περιλάβειν· μῆκος δὲ πῶδων
 ἑπτα καὶ ἑκοσί, διπλῆς σπειρας ὑπελημμένης. πλη-
 ρος δὲ συμπαντῶν δύο καὶ ἑξήκοντα καὶ ἑχάλον, κιο-
 ναράων αὐταῖς χεῖρα τὸν Κορινθίων τρόπον ἐπέξευ-
 ρασμένων γλυφαῖς, ἐκπληξίῳ ἐμποιοῦσαις διὰ τὴν τοῦ
 πάντος μεγαλουργίαν. πέντε δὲ στιχῶν ὄντων,
 τρεῖς ἀπολαμβάνουσι τὰς διὰ μέσου χώρας ταῖς
 στοαῖς. τῶν δὲ αἱ δύο παραλλήλα τὸν αὐτὸν γέ-
 γονασι τρόπον, εὐρος ἑκατέρας πῶδας περιακόντα, μῆ-
 κος δὲ σταδίων, ὕψος δὲ πῶδας ὑπὲρ πεντήκοντα· τῆς
 δὲ μέσης εὐρος μὲν ἡμιολιον, ὕψος δὲ διπλασιον. ἀνερχε
 γὰρ πλείστον πᾶρα τὰς ἑκατέρωθεν. αἱ δὲ ὀροφαι

Κατὰ μέσον] *In medio, hoc est, latere inter angulos.*

¶ Οὐδ'

ticum, quæ triplex erat, et longitudine ab orientali valle ad occidentalem usque pertinebat. Nec enim amplius produci poterat. Opus erat omnium quæ unquam sol vidit maxime memorabile. Nam cum vallis depressa admodum esset, ut inde caligarent oculi cujusquam ex alto in fundum despicientis, porticum immanis altitudinis super ea exstruxit, ut si quis ex tecti ejus summitate altitudinem simul utramque visu penetrare vellet, periculum esset ne vertigine corriperetur, priusquam visus ad immensum adeo profundum pertingeret. Quatuor autem erant columnarum series, ita ab uno porticus sine in alterum dispositæ, ut ex adverso sibi responderent, (quarta enim intertextum habebat parietem lapideum) atque crassitudo cujusque columnæ tanta erat, quantam possent tres hominum inter se contingentium ulnæ complecti, longitudo pedum septem et viginti, duplici spiraculibet columnæ subiecta. Numero autem univertsæ erant centum et sexaginta duæ, capitellis ipsarum more Corinthio sculptura obductis, opere omnino magno et mirabili. Cumque quatuor essent columnarum versus, ex illis tres spatium interceptum in porticus dividebant. Harum autem porticum duæ sibi mutuo respondentes similiter factæ erant, ut utraque haberet xxx pedes in latitudinem, in longitudinem vero stadium, atque in altitudinem plus quam quinquaginta pedes; media autem erat latitudine sesquialtera, atque altitudine dupla. Nam eas ex utraque parte multum supereminerebat. Tecta vero sculpturis ligneis profun-

' Ovd' ἀνὰ τε] Ita cum *Cod. Vat.* et non dubito quin idem voluerit *Hen.* qui habet οὐδ' ἀνὰ τε, in editis aliis οὐδ' ἀνὰ τε.

βαθυξυλοῖς ἐξηκκνῆνται γλυφαῖς, πολυτροποῖς σχη-
ματῶν εἰδεαῖς. καὶ τὸ τῆς μέσης βαθὸς ἐπὶ μεζόν
ἤγερτο, περικτετμημένου τοῖς ἐπιστυλίοις προμετωπέ-
διου τοῦχου, κίονας ἔχοντος ἐνδεδεκημένους, καὶ ξέσ-
του πάντος ὄντος, ὥς ἀπίστοιτάτα τοῖς οὐκ εἰδοσι
καὶ σὺν ἐκπληξεί θέατα τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσιν εἶναι.
τοιοῦτος μὲν ὁ πρῶτος περιβόλος ἦν, ἐν μεσῷ δὲ ἀπέ-
χων οὐ πολλὸν δευτέρος, πρόσβατος βαθμίσιν ὀλίγαις,
ὅν περὶερχε ἑρκίον λίθινου δρυφακτοῦ, γραφῇ καλύων
εἰσεναὶ τὸν ἀλλοεθνῆ, θανατικῆς ἀπειλουμένης τῆς
ζήμιας. εἶχε δ' ὁ μὲν ἐντὸς περιβόλος, χάτα μὲν τὸ
νοτιον καὶ βορειον κλίμα, τριστιγχοῦς πυλώνας, ἀλ-
ληλῶν διεστώτας· χάτα δὲ ἡλίου βολας, ἓνα τὸν
μεγαν, δι' οὗ παρῆειμεν ἄγνοι μετὰ γυναικῶν. ἐσω-
τέρῳ δὲ κακείνου γυναιξίν αἶσάτον ἦν τὸ ἱερόν. ἐκείνου
δ' ἐνδοτέρῳ τρίτον, ὅπου τοῖς ἱερευσὶν εἰσελθεῖν ἔξον ἦν
μονοῖς. ὁ ναὸς ἐν τούτῳ, καὶ πρὸ αὐτοῦ βῶμος ἦν,
ἐφ' οὗ τὰς θυσίας ὀλοκαυτούμεν τῷ Θεῷ. τούτων
^ε εἰς οὐδὲνα τῶν τριῶν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρώδης παρῆλθεν.
ἐκκώλυτο γὰρ οὐκ ὦν ἱερεὺς. ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἐργοῖς
τα περὶ τὰς στοάς καὶ τοὺς ἔξω περιβόλους ἐπραγ-
ματεύετο· καὶ ταῦτα ὠκοδομήσεν ἐτεσὶν ὀκτώ.

ς'. Τοῦ δὲ ^η ναοῦ διὰ τῶν ἱερῶν οἰκοδομηθέντος
^ι ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ μὴσιν ἑξ, ἅπας ὁ λαὸς ἐπληρώθη χάρας,

^ε εἰς οὐδὲνα] Locus hic de mendo suspectus, adeo ut forsan legendum τούτων εἰς οὐδέντερον ὁ βασιλ. vel τούτων εἰς οὐδέντερον τῶν δυο ὁ βασ. nisi βῶμος in τῶν τριῶν numerum veniat, aut aliquid exciderit textui de *Sancto Sanctiorum*.

^η Ναον] Notandum hic τὸν ναὸν et τὸ ἱερόν distingui, ut illa voce *ædes ipsa* sive *templum* proprie dictum, hac vero exteriora ædificia

dis erant exornata, in varias formarum species elaboratis: atque medium in maiorem altitudinem evectum est, muro frontali epistylis circumfecto, et columnis insertis distincto, totoque ad amussim polito, ut qui non viderant minime fidem istis haberent, nec sine admiratione a præsentibus spectarentur. Atque huiusmodi quidem erat primum septum, in medio vero juxta illud etiam alterum, in quod paucis gradibus ascendebatur, circumdante lapidea maceria, cum inscriptione quæ vetaret alienigenam intare sub poena capitis. Habebat autem interius conseptum a parte meridionali et septentrionali portas tres continuas *æqualiter* inter se distantes; et ab oriente magnam portam, per quam mundi cum feminis intrare consuevimus. Adhuc autem interius erat sanctuarium, quo feminæ non intrabant. Et porro interius erat tertium, quo non nisi sacerdotibus licebat introire. Hæc erat ædes, et ante eam altare, in quo solida sacrificia Deo cremamus. Horum trium in nullum ingressus est rex Herodes, ab iis enim arcebat, quoniam sacerdos non esset, sed totus in eo erat ut porticus et exteriora consepta curaret extruenda. Et ista octo annis ædificavit.

6. Postquam autem ædes a sacerdotibus uno anno et sex mensibus exædificata est, universus

ædificia et structuræ designentur. Verum hæc distinctio non perpetuo observatur.

¹ *Επαιτυ*] Etsi ista totidem annis ædificasse dicatur Herodes, non tamen nisi Agrippæ junioris temporibus, sexaginta circiter post Christum natum annis, absolutum esse totum templi ædificium, testatur *Josephus*, l. 20. c. 8. Videfis *Casaub.* c. *Baron.* in *Exerc.* XIII. n. 22. et *L. Capellum* in *Spicileg.* in *Joannem* c. 1. v. 20. p. 60. et *Usserium* ad A. M. 3987.

* *Ανακτις*]

καὶ τοῦ ταχέως πρῶτον μὲν τῷ Θεῷ τὰς εὐχαριστίας ἐπιποιῦντο, μετὰ δὲ καὶ τῆς προθυμίας τοῦ βασιλέως, ἑορταζόντες καὶ χατευφημούντες τὴν ἀνακτισιν. ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς τριακοσίους ἐθύσε τῷ Θεῷ βίβας, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων οἱ ἑκατὰ δυνάμιν· ὧν οὐχ οἶόν τε τὸν ἀριθμὸν εἶπεν, ἐκφρευγὶ γὰρ τὸ δυνάσθαι πρὸς ἀληθείαν ἐκπεν. συνεκπεπλήκει γὰρ τῇ ¹προθυμίᾳ τοῦ περὶ τὸν ναὸν ἔργου, καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν τῷ βασιλεὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς, ἣν ἐξ ἑθους ἑορταζέει, εἰς ταῦτα ἐλθεῖν· καὶ περισημολογήσῃ δι' αὐτοῖν τὴν ἑορτὴν γινώσθαι.

ζ'. Κατεσκευασθῇ δὲ καὶ ²κρυπτή διαφυγὴ τῷ βασιλεὶ, φερούσα μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀντανίας μέχρι τοῦ ἐσθῆν ἱεροῦ πρὸς τὴν ἀνατολικὴν θύραν, ἐφ' ἧς αὐτῷ καὶ πύργον κατεσκεύασεν, ἵνα ἔχῃ διὰ πῶν ὑπογαίων εἰς αὐτὸν ἀνιέναι, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ δήμου νεώτεριστον ἐπὶ τοῖς βασιλεὺσι φυλαττόμενος. λέγεται δὲ, καὶ ἐκεῖνον τὸν καιρὸν οἰκοδομουμένου τοῦ ναοῦ, τὰς μὲν ἡμέρας οὐχ' εἶναι, ἐν δὲ ταῖς νύξιν γινώσθαι τοὺς οὐβρούς, ὥς μὴ κωλύσῃ τὸ ἔργον. καὶ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον οἱ πατέρες ἡμῖν παρέδωκαν. οὐδ' ἐστὶν ἀπίστον, εἰ καὶ πρὸς τὰς ἄλλας ἐπιδεί τις ἐμφανείας τοῦ Θεοῦ. τὰ μὲν οὖν περὶ τὸν ναὸν ἐξοικοδομηθῇ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον.

² Ἀνακτισιν] Ανακτίζειν Græcis urbem restaurare, ut apud Dion. Chrysost. Orat. II. p. 36. SPANH.

¹ Προθυμία] Hæc Encæniam ab Herode semel sunt peracta, ob renovatum a se templum; itaque diversa sunt ab Encæniarum festo (de quo Joann. c. 10. v. 22.) quæ quotannis celebrata erant ob repurgatum a Juda Maccabæo templum.

³ Κρυπτή διαφυγὴ τῷ βασιλεὶ] Simillimum fuit institutum Tyrannorum Siciliæ, qui in urbe Syracusis tales etiam subterraneas extruxerunt

populus lætitiæ plenus erat, Deoque gratias agebant, primum quod tam cito factum fuisset, deinde quod eam operi diligentiam adhibuisset rex, festum diem agentes, et templi instaurationem faustis ominibus prosequentes. Rex autem Deo trecentos boves immolavit; reliqui item pro sua quisque facultate: quorum numerum dicere haud fas est, quod ad veritatem quo pacto dicendus sit nos lateat. Nam acciderat, ut idem esset dies inaugurationis regis, quem celebrare solitus erat, ac ille, quo templum fuit absolutum; atque adeo his duabus de causis festum illustrius.

7. Præterea regi facta est fossa occulta, ab Antonia ferens ad orientalem portam templi, super quam etiam sibi met turrin exstruendam curavit, ut per subterranea in ipsam ascenderet, quo cave-retur a populo si quando adversus reges novi aliquid molirentur. Fertur etiam, quo tempore templum construebatur, non nisi noctu pluuisse, ne opus impediretur. Id quod a majoribus accepimus. Neque incredibile est, si quis animum advertat ad alia quibus semet nobis patefecerit Deus. Et quæ ad templum quidem spectant hoc modo exædificata erant.

extruxerunt cryptas; in ea parte quæ *Arcadina* appellabatur; cujus mirandæ adhuc supersunt reliquæ, laudatæ a *Jo. Bonanno* in *Syracusi Antiquis*, pag. 7. ed. Italæ, nostræ vero Latinæ, p. 57. atque singulari cum cura descriptæ atque depictæ a *Vincentio Mirabella*, in *Syracusi suis Antiquis*, pag. ed. Italæ 79, nostræ vero Latinæ 98. Sunt autem hi libri inserti in *Thesaurο Antiq. Siciliæ*. Hav.

J. A. E R N E S T I.
D E
TEMPL O HERODIS M,
AD AGGAEI CAP. II. IO. ET JOSEPHI
A. I. XV. EXTR.

C. D.

V E R E profecto et eleganter Siculus ille
Diodorus Lib. I. init. in ceteris histo-
riæ laudibus etiam hoc ponit, ut eam quan-
dam quasi *metropolin universae Philosophiae* ap-
pellet, non modo hujus, quae hodie vulgo di-
citur, sed ejus, quae omni rerum divinarum
humanarumque, omnium magnarum discipli-
narum scientia continetur. Nam profecto nul-
la propemodum est doctrina, quae, si se satis
norit, aut grata esse velit, non cogitur fateri,
se historiae non modo commoda et ornamenta
plurima, sed vitam adeo ipsam debere, eique
quasi colonico quodam jure obstrictam teneri.
Scilicet, ut hoc se debere quondam coloniae
existimabant metropoli quaeque suae, ut eam
parentis in modum revererentur, et colerent,
cui omnia se debere scirent, legatos quotannis

* D

in

in eam mitterent, sacra ibi facturos, Pontifices ab ea acciperent, ejus Legatis primum in conventibus publicis locum tribuerent, et, si quando aliam coloniam vellent deducere, ejus ducem ab illa peterent * : sic disciplinae eae, quae maxime ab historia derivatae sunt, debent primum agnoscere origines suas ; non se *αυτοχθόνας*, ut quondam Athenienses, .h. e. a nulla alia ortas, ex se natas, jactare ; non arrogantes et improbos homines imitari, quos cum fortuna divitiis, honoribus, longe supra parentes extulit, pudere parentum incipit, ut eos agnoscere nolint ; ejus porro veluti sacra, leges, conservare, ea duce in rebus magnis uti. Atque id adeo debent facere studiosius, cum experientia satis docuerit, omnes illas disciplinas ad interitum ruere, cum primum ea vincula, quibus historiae, matri, adstrictae sint, rumpere, et se *αμητορας* facere cœperint. Nam profecto omnis illa barbaries, qua disciplinae omnes per tot secula obscuratae atque deletae jacuerunt, nulla alia ex re nata est, quam e contemptu historiae, earumque linguarum, quarum scientia continetur. Quid ? cum tandem pertaesum esset tenebrarum illarum, et orto lucis desiderio, barbariei depellendae

* Vid. Collecta Vales. ad Excerpt. Peiresc. p. 8. unde repetiere Hudf. ad Thucyd. I. 25. Spanh. de U. & P. N. Diff. IX. 3.

cupido

cupido injecta esset hominibus, nonne ab historia petenda auxilia fuerunt, faciendumque id, quod coloniae quondam fecissent, ut, cum ignis facer, qui e metropoli adlatus in Prytaneo arderet, casu quodam esset extinctus, non aliunde, quam e Prytaneo metropoleos suae repeteretur. Quo magis arbitror esse eorum, qui bonis literis docendis tuendisque praesint, in tempore imbuere animos juvenum iis opinionibus, ut de natura disciplinarum omnium recte sentiant, existimentque, in iis sine historia, multisque literis effici praeclari nihil posse.

Sed historia, quam majorum disciplinarum studiosis atque magistris commendatam esse volumus, plurimum refert, quomodo vel discatur, vel tradatur. Neque enim nos commendamus juventuti, aut tradimus eam, quae insit in commemoratione rerum, in vulgari-bus libellis obviarum, quae mulierculis aptior est, quam eruditis hominibus, neque opus magistro erudito habet; sed quæ per linguarum scientiam e fontibus ipsis ducta sit, et rursus ad ipsos fontes adducat, amore ipsorum injecto, et facultate ex iis hauriendi adjuncta. Quod fit, cum aliis rebus, tum diligentia explanandae consuetudinis loquendi, qua historici in rebus tradendis utuntur. Id nisi fit, aut coeca fide arripiunt a quolibet narrata, aut difficultatibus quibusdam irretiti, se expedire

dire nullo modo poterunt. Ejus rei cum permulta exempla sunt, tum etiam illud, cujus memoria mihi renovata est nuper, cum in Tacito recensendo ad illustrem illum locum de rebus Judaicis, temploque Hierosolymitano venissem, in eoque subinde Josephus comparandus esset, itemque ante paucos dies, cum historiae catholicae elementa enarrans, ad locum de instaurato per Zorobabelem templo delatus, ostenderem, quanta vis adversus Judaeos esset in noto Aggaei vaticinio. Scilicet, magna difficultas oblata est permultis in loco Josephi, de Herodis M. munificentia adversus templum Hierosolymitanum; quem, admirandum est, quam interdum vexent, qui cum aut consentaneum vaticinio Aggaei, de templo secundo, efficere velint, aut ab eo discrepare sibi persuaferint. Nam alii aut partem tantum aedificatam statuunt, aut instauracionem et exornationem tantum majorem faciam esse, praesertim in interiori parte, quae הבית Hebraeis dicitur, veriti, ne non alterum templum relinquatur, si omnia, imprimisque חֵכֶל, destructa dicantur: alii, Graece doctiores, cum videant, non satis commode ita intelligi Josephum posse, aut fidem ejus in hac quoque parte dubiam faciunt, aut, si eo non descendunt, tamen, dum conciliare eum cum Aggaco conantur, se laborare indicant.

Omniq

Omnino supra ceteros infelix scriptor est Josephus, praeter meritum suum, cum ob elegantiam sit optima fortuna dignissimus. Perpauci sunt, qui cum uno tenore iusta cum diligentia legant; pauciores, qui tantum Hebraice, Graece, Latineque (nam has tres linguas teneri, recte volebat Casaubonus) sciant, ut eum satis intelligere possint, ne ex eorum quidem numero, qui vel maxime propter disciplinae suae professionem, debebant. Ceterum, ut de quoque ejus loco quaestio aut controversia incidit, ita quisque, inspecto illo loco, vel e versione, vel, si plus sapiat, e Graecis, ope Lexici triobolaris adjutus, fortiter de eo in utramvis partem judicat. Quamquam in hoc se consolari possit Josephus, ipsorum sacrorum librorum fortuna, qui non aliter vulgo ab iis tractantur, qui eorum se interpretes ferunt. Ego quidem spero, me hac scriptiuncula effecturum, primo, ut nemo dubitare possit, Herodem templum totum a fundamentis aedificasse, destructo per partes vetere; deinde, ut appareat, ex consuetudine loquendi historica, omninoque populari, templum illud nihilominus secundum et fuisse, et recte appellatum esse.

Ac primum studiosos velim animadvertere, Josephum distinguere perpetuo *ναων τῶ θεῷ*, seu *ναον* et *περιβολον*. *Ναος* est aedes, *לְבֵית*, *το τεμενος* vel

vel *τεμενισμα* alias vocatur, eoque sensu id verbum plerumque et in libris sacris dicitur. *Περίβολος*, (quem male Latinus interpres *ambitum* interpretatur, paullo melius interdum *septum*, cujus quippe usum praestabant *οἱ περιβολοι*,) fuit *porticus*, *basilica*, *בֵּית*, (*πρόναον* Josephus aliquo loco vocat interiorem) eratque triplex, ut docet Josephus: unus extremo *ιεῦς* fine: alter, qui peregrinos arceret, tertius intra quem ara et *ναος*, qui et *πρόναος* dicitur, prohiberetque aditu omnes, qui sacerdotes non essent. Horum *περιβολων* ratio et usus debet cognitus esse, si nolis falsa imaginari in multis N. T. locis, ubi et ipsi *ιεῦς* nomine veniunt, sicut apud Josephum quoque interiores ita appellantur XV. 11. 5. Nempe in his *περιβολοις* non modo erant *συναγωγαί*, in quibus stare homines, precandi causa, differere inter se de rebus divinis, etiam docere periti solerent; sed etiam oeci multi et magni, in quibus Doctores legis erudirent discipulos, scholaeque haberent: idque imprimis intelligendum de medio. In tali oeco Christum inter Doctores reperere parentes; Christus ipse, quamquam et in porticibus (sicut Graeci philosophi in porticibus Gymnasiorum) docuit; Apostoli, Christo in coelum sublato, precandi causa conventus egere, Spiritum Sanctum die Pentecostes coelo missum accepere, &c.

Tales

* Tales oeci etiam apud Graecos ναοις adjuncti: qualis fuit ille Jovis Olympii επιστοδομος, in quo Herodotus historiam suam primum publicavit, auctore Luciano, † in quo rhetores ostentaturi eloquentiam declamabant, tradente eodem. ‡ Sed hoc obiter dictum sit.

Jam clare tradit Josephus, aedificationem ad ναον, et ad περιβολας pertinuisse: et hos quidem absolutos annis octo, illum anno uno et dimidio: sanctitatis autem, quae esset τὸ ναὸν, eam rationem habitam ab Herode, ut ipse, quamvis aedificator, non ingrederetur locum, dum fieret opus, operis autem uteretur in eo exstruendo solis sacerdotibus, διδάσας τὰς μὲν οἰκοδομοὺς, τὰς ἑτέρας δὲ τεκτονάς, jubens discere artes, quibus aedificatio constat. At quomodo ναὸν aedificavit? (nam hunc omnium minime volunt totum dirutum, vano quodam, ut videbimus, timore). Id haud ambigue docet Josephus: καταλυσας τὸ πᾶν ἔργον, destructo toto aedificio; ne fundamentis quidem relictis: ἀνελών τοὺς ἀρχαίους θεμελίους, καὶ καταβαλομένους τοὺς ἑτέρους, revulsis antiquis fundamentis, & aliis positis. An haec ullo modo per consuetudinem perpetuam loquendi Graecorum aliter intelligi possunt, quam volumus?

* Videant tirones, et quibus opus est, Lud. de Dieu Critic. Sacr. ad Act. I. 13.

† In Aëtione c. 1.

‡ In Peregrin. c. 32. ubi vid. notam Mosis Solani.

Nam

Nam fundamentis revulsis et sublatis, pristinum aedificium stare per rerum naturam non potest, ad quae eruenda ne pervenire quidem, nisi destructo ante aedificio, licet. Καταβολή autem θεμελίων nunquam aliter, nisi de aedificii plane novi initiis dicitur, unde et in sacris libris de κτίσει κόσμου solemnis formula est. Atque etiam de ipsa aedificatione utitur verbo *εγείρειν* : quod ex usu Graecorum constante, et analogia omnium linguarum, de novo aedificio dicitur. Nam et Hebraeis בָּנָה eo sensu in Piel usurpatur, Esai. LXI. 4. et in Hiphil, Es. XXXIV. 13. et Latinis *surgere* non nisi nova aedificia dicuntur, ut in illo de Carthagine Virgiliano, *O! fortunatos, quorum jam moenia surgunt*, sexcentisque locis aliis. Nec verbum κατασκευασθαι, in eadem re usurpatum, aliam vim potest habere : quod de plane novo opere dici, tum aliis innumeris locis debet constare, tum notissimo illo de arcae Noachicae aedificatione, Ebr. IX. 7. κατασκευασε κιβωτον. Denique, si Herodes tantum auctis fundamentis aliquid aedi addere voluisset, ad priorem altitudinem : nam ita capiunt quidam verba Herodis de sexaginta cubitis, templo ad Salomoneam altitudinis mensuram deficientibus, quos se additurum dicit : quale illud aedificium futurum fuisset? Non hoc fuisset επίβλημα ρακούς αγναφου επί ἱματίω παλαιῷ?

.At

At quid fiet vaticinio Aggaei, in quò Christus inducitur praesentia sua illustraturus templum alterum, quod ab reditu Judaeorum e Chaldaea institutum est? Non ita efficietur templum tertium, ut nonnulli, non modo e Judaeis, sed etiam Christianis voluere, ad nihilumque redigetur argumentum, quod ex eo loco adversus Judaeorum pertinaciam depromitur? Hoc videntur existimasse, qui fidem Flaviani traditionis in dubium vocarunt: quo maxime solemne est multis descendere in Josepho, cum se expedire nesciunt: quos recte repudiavere Cellarius, Crocius, Basnagius. Sed ille timor, ne ita pugnet cum Aggaeo Josephus, idoneis remediis depelletur. Primum igitur animadvertendum est, id quod jam Grotius monuit, ad Matth. XXIV. init. non ex ruinis, hostiliter vastato superiori templo, nec totam eodem tempore, sed per partes, dirutum, et restitutum esse; deinde habitam rationem, ut is, qui *αἰδολοχρῆμα* a Graeco interprete Danielis dicitur, quasi tu perennitatem sacrificiorum dicas, non interromperetur, uti magnus Scaliger animadvertit, in immortalis de Emend. Tempp. operis Lib. VI. (cujus libri sexti lectionem soleo commendare studiosis, ut remedium multorum errorum, quibus vulgus tenetur) idque commodè poterat fieri, cum ara, in qua victimae adolerentur,

* E

effet

esset sub dio, media inter ναον et intimum περιβολον, nec ad ipsam destructio ceterorum quicquam pertineret. Sed illud relinquebatur, ut ostenderent viri magni, haec sufficere, ut in consuetudine loquendi populari, templum ita destructum restitutumque a priori non distingueretur, sed nomine atque appellatione cum eo confunderetur: id quod nobis efficiendum summus. Ei rei autem non modo hoc prodest, animadversum illud jam aliis, quod Judaei ipsi, inque his Josephus, alterum templum, non tertium a Tito vastatum dicunt, sed etiam, quod exempla similia e scriptoribus antiquis proferri possunt. Hujus generis illud est, quod apud Tacitum H. III. 24. Antonius, dux Flavianarum partium, tertiae legionis milites admonet, *ut sub M. Antonio Parthos, sub Corbulone Armenios, nuper Sarmatas pepulissent*. Si haec ad vivum rescare quis velit, non ita fuere. Etenim ex iis, qui sub Antonio adversus Parthos bellaverant, nemo dudum superfuerat. Sed quia legio tertia nunquam neque tota caesa, neque ignominiae causa dissoluta, et dein tota simul nova facta fuerat, sine ullius offensione aut reprehensione, ne admirante quidem quodam aut haerente, tunc quoque tertianis tribuebantur, quae olim sub Antonio duce facta fuerant. Hierosolyma bina tantum fuisse satis convenit,

convenit, et *altera* esse a Tito everſa. Atqui eo tempore, quo eſt deleta urbs, non credibile eſt, ullam reliquam domum fuiſſe ex iis, quae ſtatim ab reditu Judaeorum aedificatae fuerant? Altera Roma ſemper dicta eſt, quae poſt Gallicum incendium fuit, etſi nulla e priſcis aedibus reſidua. Fert enim hoc perpetua omnium linguarum ratio, ut, quae paullatim, et per partes, cum nulla ante hoſtili aut incendii vi deleta ſint, inſtaurentur, non diſtinguantur ab iis, quae ante fuerint, ſed pro iisdem habeantur. Navis ea, qua Theſeus Cretam vectus erat, ad Minotaurum tollendum, ſaluſque redierat cum ſuis, conſervata erat ab Athenienſibus, uſque ad Demetrii Phalerei tempora, dicebaturque eſſe eadem, qua Theſeus uſus fuiſſet. At qualis illa erat, quomodo ſervata? Nempe, vetere uſque materia exempta, et nova immiſſa; ut Demetrii quidem aetate ne feſtuca quidem ex illa vetere reſtaret. Et tamen vulgo omnes Theſei navem dicebant. Soli Philoſophi, argutias captantes, ut ſolent, dubitationem movere, et ne hi quidem ſerio, aut conſenſu; vulgari conſuetudine loquendi plus valente dialecticorum vanitate, popularem loquendi rationem ad ſcholae ſubtilitates revocantium. *ὥς τοις φιλοſοφοῖς*, inquit Plutarchus *, *εἰς τὸν αὐχόμενον*

* In Theſeo. p. 10.

λογον ἀμφιδόξουμενον παραδείγμα τὰ πλῆθος εἶναι, τῶν
μῶν, ὡς το αὐτο, τῶν δὲ, ὡς αὐ το αὐτο διαμένει, λεγόντων.

Sed erunt, qui haec sibi non satisfacere di-
cant, in hac certe causa, propter verba Hebraica
בֵּית הַזֶּה הוּא הַמִּקְדָּשׁ, in quibus הוּא efficiat demonst-
rationem περιβη, quae quasi digito facta, non
signat aliud, quam illud ipsum, quod Aggaeus
ob oculos habuerit, aedificium intelligere. Ve-
rum huic difficultati admodum facile est occur-
rere. Primum, vulgare illud de vi τῆς הוּא prae-
ceptum non agnosco : nec poterunt agnoscere,
qui vel leviter attendent. Hoc ipso Aggaei loco
totum dissolvitur. Etenim, si ista vis est ejus
literae, dicant mihi magni Grammatici, quo-
modo Aggaeus templum Salomoneum, quod
ante tot annos incendio absumtum fuerat, vo-
care potuerit et ipsum בֵּית הַזֶּה הוּא *Quis est ves-*
trum, inquit, *qui viderit* בְּבֵית הַזֶּה הוּא
Deinde audire velim, quidnam per domum
hancce intellexerit Vates, quid istis verbis
demonstraverit? Aedem haud dubie, הַמִּכְלָא.
Ita enim dicunt. At istam aedem Christus
non potuit sua praesentia illustrare. Etenim,
cum sacerdos non esset, per legem Mosaicam,
quam ille non neglexit, (etenim non impune
tulisset) ingredi in aedem ipsam non potuit,
neque unquam in ea fuit : sed tantum in ex-
terioribus περιβολοις. Hoc est templum, haec
est domus, quam docendo illustriorem vetere
reddidit ;

reddidit : ut saepe miratus sim, quare difficiles sint non nulli in concedendo, *ναον* a fundamentis aedificatum esse, ubi Christus nunquam fuit, faciles in externis partibus templi, quae sedes propria gloriae ejus fuit, quam Christi praesentia et sapientia templo secundo attulit. Cur non et has tantum magnificentius exornatas pugnant, ut illud ה, jactatam vim suam obtineat. At *הבית* vocat, *οικον*, quod de aede, non de *περιβολοις* intelligendum videtur. Immo nihil impedit, e consuetudine sacrarum literarum. Cum Christus numularios et victimarum venditores ejiceret templo, ab iis, querebatur, *οικον προσευχης* conversum in speculuncam latronum. At isti homines diversabantur in porticibus, quae tamen, quia servire precibus, quas pro se quisque faceret, et similibus rebus, ad sacra pertinentibus, debebant, ac solebant, recte *οικος προσευχης* vocantur, et vel maxime intelliguntur.

His breviter disputatis, arbitror planum factum, quod proposuimus, nihil esse inter Josephum et Aggaeum dissensionis : et Christum tamen in altero templo docuisse, etsi ab Herode totum novum factum sit.

F I N I S.

(1)

E X C E R P T U M

E

FLAVII JOSEPHI

ANTIQ. JUD. LIB. XV.

•F

L. S.

Enarrationem precedat emendata lectio. Quintilian.

CUM viderem Josephi, gravissimi scriptoris, fidem dissertatione quadam edita, quam superiore libello ad partes revocavi, etiam de rebus sui temporis acriter impugnata, sed criminatibus, quas dilui posse levi opera vel ab ipsa Flaviani loci, de qua disputatur, lectione existimarem, visum fuit subungere excerptum ex Antiquitatibus Judaicis, quo continetur Templi instaurati ab Herode narratio, simulque Ernesti Dissertationem *de Templo Herodis Magni* repetitam ex *Opusculis* ejus *Philologicis*. Et cum pateret plurimos errores suboriri ex male intellecta ratione Templi solere, nec reperirem, qui de ea re melius consuleret eodem Ernesto, in præstantissima utilissimaque ejus *Institutione Interpretis Novi Testamenti*, quoniam in his terris non satis obviis est liber, lectorem observatione Ernesti per me carere nolui.

Ecce illam igitur : * Sacrorum omnium ratio, et multa præterea loca Novi Testamenti non bene intelligi possunt sine notitia Templi, quod ab Herode Magno per partes destructum et restitutum est. In quo rursus frustra fides detrahitur Josepho, sacerdoti, qui illud Templum viderat, non historicis argumentis, sed metu ne ea res obsit nobili loco Haggæi 2. 10, de templi secundi dignitate : cum ea Josephi narratio bene conveniat testimoniis apud Matthæum, 24, 1. et Joannem 2, 20. Sed nos illum etiam metum inanem esse demonstravimus in Prolusione de Templo secundo ad Haggæi locum. In templo autem cognoscendo nihil attinet,

* P. 247. ed. tertia,

attinet, imitari eos, qui in Salomonei templi descriptione tota constituenda frustra laborarunt. Nam etsi Josephus scriptor est eruditus disciplinis et artibus, a quo accurata descriptio erat speranda: tamen rei natura non patitur, talium operum, præsertim magnorum et e multis partibus nexorum, descriptiones tales fieri, ne ab architecto quidem dicendi perito, ut sine figuris plane intelligi, et inde forma eorum accurate vel concipi vel pingi possit: quod patet exemplis descriptionum talium apud disertissimos et pertissimos scriptores, etiam Vitruvium et Plinium, cujus villas nemo adhuc potuit ex ejus descriptione, ita exprimere, ut peritis satisfaceret.

Itaque satis erit ad intelligendum, nosse primum discrimen *ναου* et *ισκου*, deinde partes majores, *ναου*, in quo et *το αγιον* solis sacerdotibus patens, cum sacris nonnullis (Ebr. 9.) de quibus non poeniteat Deylingium *Observ.* II. n. 47. legisse, et *αδυτον*, in quod *soli* Pontifici, *una* modo *die* (anni,) semel ingredi fas erat, ut rursus Philo *Leg. ad Caium* p. 1035. tradit, *non quater*, ut magistris Judaicis vulgo creditur: circumjectam porro aream, in qua ara, ubi sacrificia et preces factæ, quo non adire liceret, nisi Sacerdoti et Levitæ: atria deinde cætera, basilicas nobiliores, in historiis sacris memoratas, et loricas vel septa, quibus atria diremta, hoc est, substructiones, in quibus cæci plures (Act. 2, 2.) servientes cœtibus discantium, precantiumve, diætæ et cubicula ad usus Sacerdotum et Levitarum *λειτουργιας* tempore, gazophylacium, &c. Quibus bene notis, licebit in singularum rerum commemoratione, ad suum quæque locum et usum referre, ne morum nostrorum cogitatione conturbemur, et ineptas res comminiscamur contra historiam, et templi rationem; cujus generis multa me audire et legere memini, quæ commemorare non est necesse. Alia, quæ e magistris Judæorum minute perferuntur

tur vel commentitia sunt, vel Interpreti nihil profuit. Hactenus Ernestus. Conferendum esse quoque de discrimine inter το ἱερον et τον ναον, copiose diligenterque exponentem Kypkenium in *Obs. Sacr.* T. I. p. 136. sq. monet Krebsius in *Lexico Novi Testamenti*, V. Ἱερον.

Præterea volui Josephi loco subvenire, ut potui, nonnullis conjecturis, quæ mihi inter legendum animo obversabantur. Pro lectione igitur Hudsoniana κατασκευασθαι, P. 2. legendum esse κατασκευασθαι jam effectum esse opinor, (Remarks, p. 39, 40.)

P. 4. l. 15. Το δε της επιχειρησεως, ἥς νυν επιχειρεῖν βουλομαι. Sic in vulgatis: nec male. Varietas vero librorum *Hen.* et *Lugd. Bat.* ἥς νυν επιχειρεῖν επιβαλλομαι, alteram lectionem subinducat, quæ fortasse verior: ἥς νυν επιβαλλομαι. Επιχειρεῖν βουλομαι glossema esse putem του επιβαλλομαι. Initio hujus capituli dixit, εργον ου το τυχον επιβαλετο.

P. 4. l. 16. Παντος ευσεβιστατου και καλλιστου εφ' ἡμιν γενεσθαι νυν εφανα. Primum desidero articulum ante εφ' ἡμιν, et legendum censeo καλλιστον των εφ' ἡμων --- h. e. των ἀπαντων αὐτῷ πεπραγμενων. Vertendum vero εφ' ἡμων, *me regnante*, ἐπὶ της εμαυτου βασιλειας. Paulo superius dictum, Τα μιν ἀλλα μοι των κατὰ την βασιλειαν πραγμάτων.

P. 6. l. 2. ουκ εσχον ευκαιριαν το πρωτον της ευσεβειας αρχετυπον εις ταυτον αναγαγειν μεγαθος. Sententiam bene vidit Hudsonus notis: *ad eandem cum primo pietatis exemplari magnitudinem*, ut κατὰ ante το πρωτον subintelligeretur. Ex sententiæ autem et constructionis vi legendum esse videtur, ουκ εσχον ευκαιριαν τῷ πρωτῷ της ευσεβειας αρχετυπῷ εις ταυτον αναγαγειν μεγαθος, hoc est, εις ταυτον μεγαθος τῷ πρωτῷ --- constructione notissima. Similiter εις ταυτον disjunctum est α προδισμια loco inferiore hujus capituli §. 6. Συνεκπεττωκει γαρ τη προδισμια του περι τον ναον εργου, και την ἡμεραν τῷ βασιλει της αρχης, ἣν ἐξ εδους ιωρταζεν, εις ταυτον ελθεν: hoc est, συνεκπεττωκει την ἡμεραν τῷ βασιλει

βασιλεῖ τῆς ἀρχῆς εἰς ταῦτον εἰλθὲν τῇ προθεσμίᾳ, &c.
h. e. *Contigerat ut dies, quo rex auspiciatus est imperium,
in idem tempus accideret* (εἰς ταῦτον εἰλθὲν συν π.) *cum
festo templi absoluti.*

P. 6. l. 10. περασομαι --- αποδουναι τῷ θεῷ τὴν ἀνθ' ὧν ἐτυχον τῆσδε τῆς βασιλείας εὐσεβείαν. *Extrema ver-
tunt, hujusce regni pietatem. Male, ut mihi videtur.
Conjungendum enim τῆσδε τῆς βασιλείας cum ἐτυχον,
non cum εὐσεβείαν puto: ἀνθ' ὧν ἐτυχον τῆς δὲ τῆς βασι-
λείας, pro eo quod potitus sum hoc regno. Paulo ante
dixit, ἐπεὶ δ' ἔνυν ἐγὼ ἀρχῶ, Θεοῦ βουλήσει.*

P. 6. l. ult. Καὶ ἱερεῦσιν τὸν ἀριθμὸν χιλίοις ἱερᾶτικὰς
ἀντισταμένους στολᾶς. *Cogitabam εργατικὰς scilicet ἐρ-
ταῖς idoneas, quippe quibus induerentur sacerdotes
inter laborandum.*

P. 8. l. 1. τοὺς μὲν διδάξας οἰκοδομοὺς, ἑτέροισι δὲ τέκ-
τονας &c. *Conjecit ἐπιταξας vel καταστήσας οικονομους
Montacutius: διαταξας Cotelerius. At οικονομους pa-
rum convenire Josepho, qui postea dicit τοῦ θεοῦ
διὰ τῶν ἱερῶν οἰκοδομηθέντος monuit Hudsonus. Ut
mutare vellent induxisse videtur viros doctos parum
perspecta vis verbi διδάξας, quod non significat “cum
“docuisset artem architectonicam,” hoc enim ab He-
rode alienum proculdubio: sed cum docendum cura-
visset. De hac vi vocis διδάσκω vide Hemsterhusium
ad Aristophanis Plutum, p. 4.*

P. 8. l. 4, &c. Credunt nonnulli * Josephum ple-
nius dicturum fuisse, quomodo per partes destrueretur
Templum et ædificaretur, si voluisset Herodem
Templum revera reædificasse. Rem profecto ita bre-
viter expediisse, an parum conveniat nec ne artis
historicæ rationi, alii decernant: illud vero con-
stat, aliter Josepho visum esse, ubi Zerubbabeli
ædificationem describeret, quippe totum potius
quam omnia memoranti, L. XI. c. 4. §. 2. *Εν τῇ
δευτέρῳ εἰπὶ τῆς εἰς Ἱερουσαλὺμα κατὰ τοῦ, τῶν Ἰουδαίων μνη*

* Vide Remarks, p. 30.

δευτέρῳ παραγενομένων, συνεχετο ἡ τοῦ ναοῦ κατασκευή. Καὶ τοὺς θεμελίους ἐγκραντες τῇ νομηκίᾳ τοῦ δευτέρου μῦθος τοῦ δευτέρου τοὺς ἐπικδομοῦν, πρῶστησαν τοὺς ἐργῶν, λευϊτῶν τε τοὺς ἀκροστον εἰς πῆλ γεγονοτάς, καὶ Ἰησοῦν καὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς, καὶ Ζωδμίηλον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ Ἰουδα τοῦ Ἀμινάδαθου καὶ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ὁ μὲν ναός, πάσῃ χρησαμένων σπουδῇ τῶν τῆς ἐπιμελείαν ἐγκα-
χρισμένων, ὅστων ἡ προσεδόχησεν αὐτὸς εἰς τέλος.

P. 10. l. 11, 12. De hoc loco jam dictum. (Remarks, p. 40, sq.)

P. 10. l. 12. ἀμφὼ δ' ἦσαν μεγάλου τειχούς. Hudsonus putat his verbis ellipsin esse præpositionis ἐπὶ, ut sit ἀμφὼ δ' ἦσαν ἐπὶ μ. τ. Melius fortasse legendum Ἀμφὼ δ' ἐφίστασαν μεγάλου τειχούς.

P. 18. l. 5. ἀξιαφηγητοτάτων τῶν ὑφ' ἡλῶ. Non ita caute voluit, ut opinor: scilicet non ex numero ἀξιαφηγητοτάτων, sed plane ἀξιαφηγητότατον τῶν ὑφ' ἡλῶ, ut supra ex emendatione nostra καλλίστην τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῶν.

P. 20. l. 19. τούτων εἰς οὐδενὰ τῶν τριῶν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρώδης παρηλθεν. Εἰκεκώλυτο γὰρ οὐκ ὢν ἱερεὺς. Hudsoni conjecturas vide ad locum. At simplicius, et fortasse a vera lectione propius esse videatur legere, τούτων οὐδὲ εἰς τὸ τρίτον ὁ β. Η. π. *Horum vero tertium minime intravit rex.*

Cæterum non abs re fore nec incommodum credidi Varias Lectiones hujus capituli undecimi libri quindecimi e Codice Regio Parisiensi (Nº. 1420) petitas addere paucas ex plurimis, sed insigniores.

P. 6. l. 18. ἐπιβουλῆς

P. 8. l. 12. βασιλικῶν

P. 10, l. 3. ποικιλίαν

—— l. 11. ὑπερβαλομένους

—— resultat. ἐλίστατοις πετρῆαις pro κατὰ λίθαις π.

P. 12. antepen. βασιλικῶν

P. 16. l. 15. εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν

P. 20.

P. 20. l. 1, 2. σχηματοειδαις

—— l. 6. συν εκπληξην δε κατα τοις

—— l. 8. ολιγον

—— l. 12. τριστιχους πυλας

Veterem lectionem refert p. 2. l. 4. κατασκευασθαι.

P. 4. l. 21. αμειν. P. 16. l. 7. συμφυτον. Ubi vel

mei vel typothetae incuria accidit ut textus referret
vulgatam συμφυτρην, Latina vero versio sit Haver-

campi συμφωνον. Nec tamen male erratum : imo me-

lior lectio συμφυτον quam συμφωνον. Συμφωνον est quod

vocem vel sonum congruentem habet : συμφυλον quod for-

mam vel figuram alteri rei congruentem habet : (ad ra-

tiorem enim, sed veram et primam vocis φωνης fig-

nificationem pertinet, hoc est, *formam*, *speciem*) quo-

rum adeo hoc multo magis convenit figilli expres-

sioni quam illud. P. 20, l. 19. vulgatam habet τα-

τω εις ουδενα των τριων.